THE COMMUNIST

ol. XI FEBRUARY, 1932 No. 2

FROM THE CONTENTS

The International Significance of Bolshevism
—M. H. C.

The Problem of Cadres in the Party . C. Smith

Growing Revolt in Japan . . . . . Nakata

A Year of Sharp Class Struggles in Canada
—Sam Carr

On the Theoretical Foundations of Marxism-Leninism . . . . . V. Adoratsky

For a Bolshevist Study of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
—I. M. Kaganovich

The Communist Party and Parliamentarism
Theses Adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920

20 Cents

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Pamphlets

Each pamphlet a condensed work on current economic, social and political questions and events. All the data on each subject treated is collected in these pamphlets and made available in popular form for workers, organizers and speakers. A rapidly growing library on important subjects, each number of permanent value.

Just Published

16. PROFITS AND WAGES, *by Anna Rochester* . . . 10c
How is the wealth of the country distributed? Employers' incomes and workers' earnings.

17. SPYING ON WORKERS, *by Robert W. Dunn* . . . 10c
How the employers' spies work, the labor-spy agencies and who uses them.

18. THE AMERICAN NEGRO, *by J. S. Allen* 10c
Conditions of the Negro poor farmers and workers in the U.S.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED:

1. MODERN FARMING—SOVIET STYLE, *by Anna Louise Strong* 10c
2. WAR IN THE FAR EAST, *by Henry Hall* 10c
3. CHEMICAL WARFARE, *by Donald Cameron* 10c
4. WORK OR WAGES, *by Grace Burnham* 10c
5. THE STRUGGLE OF THE MARINE WORKERS, *by N. Sparks* 20c
6. SPEEDING UP THE WORKERS, *by James Barnett* 10c
7. YANKEE COLONIES, *by Harry Gannes* 10c
8. THE FRAME-UP SYSTEM, *by Vern Smith* 10c
9. STEVE KATOVIS, *by Joseph North and A. B. Magil* 10c
10. THE HERITAGE OF GENE DEBS, *by Alexander Trachtenberg* 10c
11. SOCIAL INSURANCE, *by Grace Burnham* 10c
12. THE PARIS COMMUNE—A STORY IN PICTURES, *by Wm. Siegel* 10c
13. YOUTH IN INDUSTRY, *by Grace Hutchins* 10c
14. THE HISTORY OF MAY DAY, *by Alexander Trachtenberg* 10c
15. THE CHURCH AND THE WORKERS, *by Bennett Stevens* . . 10c

TO APPEAR SHORTLY:

19. MANCHURIA AND THE WAR DANGER, *by Ray Stewart* 10c
20. THE AMERICAN FARMER, *by A. Bosse and Harrison George* 10c
21. DANGEROUS JOBS, *by Grace Burnham* 10c

IN PREPARATION:

CHINESE SOVIETS, *by M. James and Doonping*
THE FIGHT FOR THE SHORTER WORKDAY, *by Bert Grant*
THE YELLOW DOG CONTRACT, *by Carol Weiss King*

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Published Monthly by the
Communist Party of the United States of America

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1890.

VOL. XI FEBRUARY, 1932 No. 2

CONTENTS:

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BOLSHEVISM 99
By M. H. C.

THE PROBLEM OF CADRES IN THE PARTY 110
By C. SMITH

GROWING REVOLT IN JAPAN 124
By NAKATA

A YEAR OF SHARP CLASS STRUGGLES IN CANADA 131
By SAM CARR (Toronto)

ON THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MARXISM-LENINISM (continued from last issue) 141
By V. ADORATSKY

FOR A BOLSHEVIST STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION 159
Speech by I. M. KAGANOVITCH

STATEMENT OF COMRADE YAROSLAVSKY 179
In connection with comrade Stalin's letter on the Slutsky article

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND PARLIAMENTARISM 184
Theses adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International July 17-August 7, 1920.

Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to: THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Station D, (50 East 13th Street), New York. Subscription rates $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To Our Readers

Have you taken up activity to build the circulation of *The Communist* among your acquaintances and shop-mates? The interest in the theory of the revolutionary movement—Marxism-Leninism—which lies at the basis of all revolutionary activity, is widespread and increasing. You must help to further broaden, deepen and crystallize this interest into deep revolutionary understanding and organization. In this work the building of the circulation of *The Communist* is of utmost importance.

Don't forget that we are offering the SIX VOLUME SET OF LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS as a premium to those obtaining 20 YEARLY SUBSCRIPTIONS to *The Communist* —also other valuable premiums in books and pamphlets to those obtaining less than 20 yearly subscriptions.

Send in TODAY to The Communist, P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City for your SUBSCRIPTION RECEIPT BOOK and begin this work at once.

THE MANAGEMENT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The International Significance of Bolshevism

By M. H. C.

I

THE letter of comrade Stalin to the magazine *Proletarskaya Revoluzia* on some questions relating to the history of Bolshevism, not only exposes the falsifiers of history, the Slutskys, Volosevitches, Mironovs, etc., but is of world historical significance. It emphasizes the necessity of Bolshevik vigilance on the theoretical front. It mobilizes the Communist International for a more determined fight against Trotskyism, against Luxemburgism, against right opportunism as well as against all renegades from Marxism-Leninism. The letter of comrade Stalin further exposes the rotten liberalism and mistakes on the part of some Bolshevik editors and historians, who discuss axioms of Bolshevism that are not debatable. The international character of comrade Stalin's letter makes it necessary for the C. P. U. S. A. to utilize it for the further Bolshevization of our Party.

Is it accidental that the enemies of Bolshevism are trying to smuggle in an alien class ideology and utilize the theoretical front in the fight against the Party of Lenin against the Comintern and against the Soviet Union? Of course not.

The Soviet Union is now entering the fourth year of the Five-Year Plan, and it is indisputable that the Five-Year Plan will be completed in four years. The foundation of Socialism is being completed. Today 62 per cent of all the individual peasant holdings are organized into collective farms. This is taking place with a socialist offensive on all fronts. But classes in the Soviet Union are not yet completely liquidated, the class struggle still continues, although the question of "who whom" within the Soviet Union has already been decided in favor of Socialism. The dying capitalist elements, however, are still offering resistance. The class enemy finds new forms of expression and we see new manifestations of opportunism.

In the last few months right opportunism in practice raised its head in the Grain Trust and Sugar Trust. During the grain gathering campaign, attempts were made by the opportunists to injure the proletarian state, to fool the Party and to interfere with the general government plan. With all their strength the Party and the masses smashed these manifestations of kulak ideology as ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed by the opportunists. At the same time the Party had to strike at some "left" tendencies, which wanted only inflated percentage figures but neglected the organization and strengthening of the collective farms. Some even wanted to immediately transform the collective farms into Soviet farms. It is clear that such tendencies play into the hand of the class enemy, the kulaks. The C. P. S. U. carries on a struggle on two fronts, against any deviations from the line of the Bolshevik Central Committee. This struggle is carried on in practical work as well as on the theoretical front—the two are not and cannot be separated.

The right opportunists and the Trotskyists have been smashed and exposed before the great masses. It is therefore difficult for them to come out openly under their own banner. Comrade Kaganovich said: "that is why the Trotskyists in particular, fulfill the 'social task' of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, at present coming out against the Party in a masked form." The Trotskyists are attempting to creep in through the "gates of the history of our Party."

On the international field the Trotskyists are proving, as comrade Stalin said, that they are "the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie." The capitalist world is confronted with the gravest crisis in history. Only the Soviet Union is going forward in the construction of Socialism, improving the conditions of the proletariat and toiling masses. In the Soviet Union unemployment has been liquidated. The proletariat in the capitalist countries begin to see this contrast more clearly every day. But what do the Trotskyists say? More concretely, the American Trotskyites.

> "No country that moves actively within the orbit of world economy is immune from the convulsions of the crisis" and "the Soviet Union too which has not been and cannot be liberated from the pressure of world economy." (Thesis, *Militant*, July 25, 1931.)

Thus we see the American Trotskyites also doing their share to fulfill the "social task" of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I. stated that the greatest contradiction in the world today is:

> ". . . the antagonism between the system that is *building up socialism* and the system of *decaying capitalism*. The antagonisms between the capitalist and Socialist systems have never developed with such force, and the advantages of the socialist system over the capitalist system have never been revealed so strikingly as they are now." (Thesis XI Plenum E. C. C. I.)

The Trotskyites, however, say: "Europe versus America, the central problem of the capitalist world politics." (Thesis, *Militant*,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July 25, 1931.) Why do the Trotskyites place these questions as they do? Because, as the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie they must create the theoretical premise for the attack against the Soviet Union, they must disarm the proletariat of the capitalist countries from coming to the defense of their proletarian fatherland, they must minimize the danger of intervention against the Soviet Union, help to lay a barrage for the attack of the imperialist bourgeoisie against the U. S. S. R.

Trotsky is against the Bolshevik policy of a struggle on two fronts. This is connected with his counter-revolutionary theory of *Thermidorism* and *Bonapartism*. "The essence of Robespierre policy consisted of an ever greater accentuation of the struggle on two fronts," he writes. The Trotskyites oppose a systematic struggle on two fronts, claiming that a struggle on two fronts "is an innate feature of a petty bourgeois policy." Why is Trotsky interested in showing "a similarity with Robespierre"? Because he accuses the dictatorship of the proletariat of being in a stage of centrism, and the Party leadership is pursuing a centrist petty bourgeois policy. He, Trotsky, is attempting in his slanderous way, to pose as the real revolutionist, and that Trotskyism is a wing of the Communist movement, instead of being the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Centrism was a social phenomenon in a Party not homogeneous, not monolithic. This was the case in the parties of the Second International, where the centrist leadership tried to reconcile the interests of two classes—the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. There centrism had a social base. The Communist Party, however, is the class Party of the proletariat which in struggle has separated itself from opportunism. The struggle of the Communist Party on two fronts against all deviations from Marxism-Leninism is against all petty bourgeois influences, as expressed in the right and "left" deviations. The semi-Trotskyites open the gates for the enemy. Slutsky's slander that Bolshevism did not sufficiently struggle against opportunism and centrism in the Second International is in line with the present counter-revolutionary theory of Trotskyism.

It is clear therefore that we cannot consider Trotskyism as a current, not even a wrong current, within the movement of the working class. *Trotskyism* cannot be looked upon as a fraction of Communism—it is *the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie*. In its attitude and relation to the October Revolution, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union, Trotskyism shows on what side of the barricades it stands. For the international proletariat, the October Revolution is the beginning of the world revolution. Support of the U. S. S. R. means the construction of Socialism. Only the Soviet Union headed by the Bolshevik Party is the leader

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the world revolution. Against this we see a united front, from the Trotskyites to the extreme reactionaries.

II

Slutsky's theories, as well as the theories of the other smugglers and falsifiers of the history of Bolshevism, leads to a whole line of struggle against Leninism. No liberalism must be shown to these slanderers of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. Who does not know that Bolshevism spread and grew strong in a struggle against the Populists, the Social-Revolutionaries, Legal Marxists, Economists, Mensheviks, Liquidators, Centrists, against the "left" within the ranks of the Bolsheviks—Recallists, Vanguardists, against conciliators, right deviationists and counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. Yet instead of an open fight against the ideas of the Slutskys some Bolsheviks began a "scientific" discussion whether Lenin was a Bolshevik or not, and whether Trotsky "re-armed" Bolshevism in 1917. Comrade Stalin unmasked these smugglers, and some "liberal" Bolsheviks who supplied ammunition to these enemies of the Party.

The theory of comrade Mintz counterposing "objectivity" to "political advisability" in an attempt to shield some errors contained in the collective volumes under the editorship of comrade Yaroslavsky, in which he also participated, is a non-Marxist, non-Leninist conception. It distorts the scientific nature of history. It forgets that historical materialism is the only objective theory of social development. This conception of Mintz helps the Trotskyist smugglers and villifiers of Bolshevism, who utilized this "political advisability" to smuggle in Trotskyist ideas and distort the history of the Party. It is an attempt to separate theory from practice.

The Trotskyist theories of Slutsky attempt to show that Leninism is a "national expression," an expression of Russian backwardness, etc. Who does not recall the cry of the Second International and the Mensheviks to "westernize" the Russian labor movement. The American Trotskyites also speak of "national socialism" when referring to the Soviet Union. When the October revolution was victorious the opportunists throughout the world cried out against it. Hillquit echoed the words of Kautsky:

> "According to all accepted Marxian tests, Russia was entirely unprepared for a Socialist revolution." (Hillquit, *From Marx to Lenin*, page 19.)

Further:

> "So long as the Russian Revolution was viewed as an integral part of a general world-wide rising of the working class, it was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> possible to bring it, within the accepted Marxian concept, but as an isolated event it calls for a new and different theoretical foundation." (*From Marx to Lenin, Hillquit, page* 119).

Hillquit also tried to set limits upon the October revolution, to put national limits upon it, to make Bolshevism an "isolated event," etc. The proletariat of the imperialist countries as well as the proletariat and oppressed toiling masses of the semi-colonial and colonial countries know differently. They feel the influence and power of the Bolshevik revolution. More than that, they view the October Bolshevik revolution not only as a "part of a general world-wide rising," but as the leader in this world October.

Hillquit was not alone. Oneal, the red-baiter, foamed at the mouth and cried:

> "Russian economic and bureaucratic history weighs like a mountain upon the minds of Communists. They cannot shake it off. They think in terms of this history, they see the rest of the world through it, and everything else assumes the character, dimensions, coloring and importance of an experience that is Russian." (O'Neal, *American Communism,* page 229-230.)

Other voices have joined the chorus of the Hillquits, Oneals, Thomases, Mustes, etc. The falsettos of the renegades Cannon and Lovestone is in harmony with the Hillquits and the bourgeoisie, in spite of their masks.

The international significance of Leninism, the experiences of the victorious proletarian revolution is of vital importance for the Communist Parties in all the capitalist countries. Comrade Stalin placed this question quite clearly, when he wrote:

> *"Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. To be more precise, Leninism is the theory and tactic of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactic of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."* (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism,* page 13).
>
> *"Leninism is an international phenomena. It is rooted in internationalism and is not solely Russian."* (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism,* page 79.)

This is an answer to the slanderers of Bolshevism, to those who want to throw doubt upon the internationalism of the Bolsheviks. Let us take some of the major problems that were raised by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Can they be considered only problems of the Russian Revolution? What problems did the Bolsheviks bring to the forefront? The question of the Party, the attitude of Marxists to the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the alliance between the proletariat and peasantry, the hegemony of the proletariat, of the struggle inside and outside parliament, the general strike, of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bourgeois-democratic revolution growing into the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, imperialism, liberation movement in the colonies, self-determination of nations, etc. These are not merely Russian problems but international problems.

Where does world Bolshevism come from and who prepared the basis for the Communist International? This is linked up with the question as to when the Bolsheviks stepped on the international arena. Here we must not use the methods of the "archive rats" when they point to an amendment that Lenin made to a resolution of Bebel at some international congress, etc., and use this as a date, or of slanderers who want to minimize Lenin's struggle against opportunism before the war, claiming they cannot find enough documents, etc. As comrade Stalin said in answer to these: we don't judge the actions of Lenin and the Bolsheviks by documents—but by deeds. As to documents, if one does not want to falsify, there are plenty to prove the struggle of the Bolsheviks against opportunism in the Second International. Already in 1901-02, in the magazine *Dawn,* Lenin characterized Kautsky's position on Bernstein and Millerand as a "rubber" position, a wavering position, etc.

Long before the war the Bolsheviks raise fundamental problems which are today the cornerstones, the roots of the Communist International. This, together with uncompromising struggle against opportunism and centrism in Russia and in the Second International, won for the Bolsheviks the role of leader of the international proletariat.

Radek once raised the question that the left radicals under the leadership of Luxemburg prepared the basis for the Communist International, that they were the leaders of the international movement before the war. Such a conception distorts the role of the Bolsheviks on the international arena. Radek's mistaken position was the following. Germany was faced with a proletarian revolution, while Russia, according to him, had before it the task of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Only after the war did conditions change and also the character of the revolution in Russia; this, of course, changed the role of the Bolsheviks in the International. Where does such conception lead to? It leads to a minimization of the international revolutionary character of Bolshevism. Like Trotsky, it attempts to put narrow national limits on Bolshevism.

Mironov, a semi-Trotskyist smuggler, who distorted the history of Bolshevism, also places the question in a similar manner. This ignoramus slanders Lenin, when he writes that prior to the war Lenin did not criticise Kautsky. What reasons or facts does this "historian" give? Russia, he claims, was faced with a bourgeois-democratic revolution and Kautsky was also in favor of a bour-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geois-democratic revolution. Thus this anti-Party "historian" wants to turn Lenin into a common bourgeois radical who had no disagreements with Kautsky on one of the most cardinal points of Leninism, to create the impression that Lenin did not place the problem of the growing over of the bourgeois democratic revolution into a socialist one, until 1917, when Trotsky "re-armed" Bolshevism.

It is against such "philistines and degenerates" that comrade Stalin's letter mobilizes the whole Comintern. It shows to what extent rotten liberalism had its influence even among certain people within the Party, in allowing such anti-Party writings to pose as "history" for a number of years. In the collective work, the "History of the C.P.S.U.," under the editorship of comrade Yaroslavsky, many vital questions of a principle and historical character are treated in a Trotskyite manner, and semi-Trotskyites utilized these pages to smuggle in their system of anti-Bolshevik ideas.

The falsifiers of the history of the C.P.S.U. want to create the impression that Lenin had two plans, that is, one in 1905, when the Bolsheviks were supposed to have thought only of a bourgeois democratic revolution, and another plan in 1917—after Trotsky had "re-armed" Bolshevism. One so-called historian by the name of S. Pokrovsky, who is really a falsifier, writes in his book *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* the following:

> "Lenin (1905) in this sense agreed with the *Mensheviks*, that only a revolution in the West would give the possibility to the Russian proletariat to capture power and establish its own socialist dictatorship, . . . in 1917 the question of perspectives of growing over was put differently by Lenin."

Thanks to rotten liberalism, and lack of Bolshevik vigilance such forgers have the insolence to attempt to change Lenin into a Menshevik. How did Lenin place this problem? Not in 1917, but in 1905, he wrote:

> "As far as lies within our power, within the power of the class conscious and organized proletariat, we shall at once begin to move on from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. We are for continuous revolution. We shall not be content with half measures. . . .
>
> "Without lapsing into adventurism, without being untrue to our scientific conscience, without seeking for cheap popularity, we can say and we do say only one thing: with all our strength we shall help the entire peasantry to make a democratic revolution, that it may be easier for us, the Party of the proletariat, to pass on as speedily as possible to a new and higher task, to the socialist revolution." (*Lenin*, Vol. VI, pp. 447-450.)

The question of the theory of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution is very important

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the present moment. It is of decisive significance for many parties in the Comintern in their struggle for the proletarian revolution. The distortion of this theory is connected with denial of the socialist nature of the October revolution. Such distortions lead to the denial of the possibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union with the internal strength of the country. It denies the possibility of the proletariat leading the toiling masses on the road to socialist reconstruction. Comrade Stalin already in 1924 exposed the attempts to revise the theories of Leninism on this important question.

III

It is, therefore, clear to any one acquainted with the facts of history that the Bolsheviks were the only consistent Marxists in the international labor movement. They were the only ones who could prepare the base for the Third Communist International. The left German social-democrats were not Bolsheviks—they were always vacillating between Bolshevism and Menshevism.

Any attempt to place Luxemburgism on an equal footing with Bolshevism, will injure the Bolshevization of the various sections of the Comintern. The wrong theories of Luxemburg and the left radicals must not be covered up, but must be exposed and rooted out. Wherever remnants of Luxemburgism still have influence it is more difficult to struggle against social-fascism. The renegades, Brandler and Talheimer, attempt to compare Luxemburgism to Bolshevism, in fact they speak of Luxemburgism as "German Bolshevism." The "left" German social-fascists Rosenfeld and Seydovitz carry on a struggle against Bolshevism under the mask of Luxemburgism and in this manner try to hold the social-democratic workers in the camp of the bourgeoisie and prevent them from going over to the communists.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not always support the left radicals including Rosa Luxemburg, because of differences on some of the most basic questions. For example, Luxemburg's theory of accumulation leads to the harmful theory of the automatic collapse of capitalism. Even when the German left social-democrats under the influence of the Russian revolution of 1905 accepted the general strike as a decisive weapon in political struggle, they did not develop it to the logical conclusion: the armed uprising which flows from this, as pointed out by Lenin. Luxemburg also had a wrong theory about imperialism. She and her group did not understand the importance of the colonial liberation movement in relation to the proletarian revolution. Luxemburg and the other left radicals had a wrong conception of the national question and opposed the right of self-determination of nations. The failure to see the peasant ques-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and allies for the proletariat is connected up with the mistaken theory of the permanent revolution, which she held; Luxemburg was a believer in the theory of spontaneity and came out in support of the Mensheviks as against Lenin on the question of a well organized, centralized and disciplined Party.

The left radicals under Luxemburg were a very unstable and vacillating opposition in the pre-war Second International. They were not organized, they feared a split with the centrists and other opportunists and made a fetish of "unity." Luxemburg while opposing the imperialist war did not come out decisively against Kautsky. In his criticism of the Junius pamphlet, Lenin reviews the mistakes of Luxemburg on the question of imperialist war, etc. Even in later years Rosa Luxemburg had some wrong conceptions on problems of the October revolution in Russia on the constituent assembly, national question, free press, franchise, etc. It is true that before her murder by the social-democratic hangman she recognized some of her errors on the October revolution. Nevertheless, the Mensheviks and other enemies of the Soviet Union utilized these for a struggle against Communism.

Let us take another group of left radicals in the pre-war days, the Bulgarian *Tesniaks* or the *Narrow Party* as they were called. The Tesniaks were among the best of the lefts that fought opportunism—but in no way can they be considered Bolsheviks. They did not understand the dictatorship of the proletariat, the hegemony of the proletariat, the peasant question and the meaning of a well organized, disciplined Party. Although the Tesniaks were against the imperialist war, they had no conception of Lenin's slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war. The failure to understand the peasant question proved especially fatal to the Bulgarian Communist Party during the events in that country in 1923.

It is obvious that only Lenin and the Bolsheviks could take the lead in the organization of the Comintern. Who does not remember the vacillations of the lefts at Zimmerwald and Kienthal and even at the First Congress of the Comintern? We must, therefore, emphasize once more that Lenin, the Bolsheviks, always struggled against opportunism and centrism, in Russia and in the Second International, that Lenin, besides working out the basic theories of Bolshevism as an international movement, wrote a great deal on the labor movement of England, France, Germany, etc.

The international proletariat knows that the October revolution was victorious under the leadership of the Leninist Bolshevik Party, that the Soviet Union is the leader in the world October.

The Lovestoneites and the Trotskyites have put forth the slogan of the "Internationalization of the Comintern." What is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essence of this slogan? This is an attempt to minimize the international character of Leninism, of Bolshevism. It is an attempt to divorce the Comintern from the leading Party, its strongest nucleus, the C.P.S.U., and the leader of the international proletariat, comrade Stalin. It is an attack against the Soviet Union.

We must expose the renegade Brandlerites and Lovestoneites who attempt to put claims as "inheritors" of Bolshevism. Brandler utilizes the name "Spartacus" to further his work in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lovestone has the insolence to utilize the name "majority group" which, if translated into Russian, means Bolshevik. The revolutionary workers know these lickspittles of the bourgeoisie by their real names and no amount of masquerading will help them to hide their strike-breaking role. Muste also wants a "new Party," a party "free from Moscow," a party that will be free from Bolshevism and hold the workers in the camp of the bourgeoisie or as he says:

> "The Communist Party in the United States today suffers from a mechanical dictation from outside which severely handicaps in its dealing with the American situation. Its roots are not primarily in the American soil." (*On Political Organization*, A. J. Muste, *Labor Age*, August, 1931.)

This language is not as "theoretical" as the German "left" social-fascists', but the essence of the betrayal of the working class to the bourgeoisie is very clear. The Lovestones and Cannons in their fight against the Comintern, against Bolshevism and the Soviet Union, will cover this betrayal with a "theoretical" dress. They will use other demagogy, but in reality will not change the substance. Muste even quotes Trotsky on the definition of a Party.

Let us listen to Muste further:

"We want American labor to be realistic," or further: "We must start with the conditions which he faces here in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Seattle, not the conditions somebody else faces in London, Berlin or Moscow. We mean that the American labor movement must take its orders from American workers." And again. "Nobody else can do the job here, any more than we can do the job somewhere else."

"We believe that labor must use the methods which suit the occasion, and not marry itself to a dream or a formula as to how it must gain its ends." (The C.P.L.A. by A. J. Muste, *Labor Age*, December, 1931.)

Lovestone's theory of "American exceptionalism" and by the way Trotsky's theory of "American placing Europe on rations," which is the same thing, agrees with Muste's conceptions of an exceptional Party which will work out.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "The problem of method in achieving social change in nations where political democracy has been achieved as contrasted with nations like Czarist Russia in an earlier period of political evolution." (A. J. Muste, *Labor Age*, April, 1931).

Very familiar talk! This is the international vocabulary of social-fascism, of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, of all the renegades who are fighting Bolshevism, who want to put national limits on Bolshevism. We must not make the mistake of considering any "left" social-fascist party as a group between Leninism and opportunism. Such a group is nothing but a social-fascist group and even more dangerous because of its "left" phraseology. There is only one Party that can lead the proletariat to victory and this is the Communist Party. Bolshevized and armed with the international theory of Leninism.

Comrade Stalin's letter must be a means for the further Bolshevization of the C. P. U. S. A. We must overcome this underestimation of theory which is a characteristic of the American labor movement. We must as much as possible struggle against such moods in our Party. We must struggle against remnants of the I.W.W.'ism, DeLeonism, and Luxemburgism. One need but to recall our attitude on the national question up to a few years ago, to see the influence of Luxemburgism in our Party. We have a great advantage in that we have the great weapon of Marxism-Leninism. Our task must be to master this theory, taking this theory to the broad masses. One of the greatest tests which will prove whether we understand the dialectical conection between theory and practice is to examine how far we have put into life the decisions of the Comintern, the decisions of our Central Committee.

We must carry on an uncompromising struggle against all deviations from the line of Leninism. By turning our Party into a mass Party, rooted in the factories, we will have shown the power of Leninism as an international theory and movement, and shown that we are learning from the valuable and heroic history of the Bolshevik C. P. S. U.

Comrade Stalin's letter should mean for us more vigilance and a greater check-up in our press and literature to guard against the creeping in of an ideology alien to Bolshevism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Problem of Cadres in the Party

By C. SMITH

I

Revolutionary experience and organizational skill are things that can be acquired provided the desire is there to acquire these qualities, provided the shortcomings are recognized—which in revolutionary activity is more than half way towards removing them.—LENIN.

AN EXAMINATION of the mass work of the Party, and of its internal political and organizational life, shows without question, that the development of new revolutionary cadres of Party workers, having close connection with the factories, trade unions and revolutionary movement of the unemployed, is one of the chief inner tasks of our Party.

There is a great lack of Party workers theoretically trained and tested in revolutionary practice. This is keenly felt at the present time, because the sharpened economic and political situation, nationally as well as internationally, brings us face to face with great tasks, never before present to this extent. We are experiencing a radicalization of the workers, growing at a swift tempo, mass strikes breaking out in many parts of the country, often in the most important industries, as in mining, also in the textile industry, as well as a strong ferment among the steel and railroad workers. At the same time, the Party has the task of mobilizing and organizing an army millions strong, against capital, upon the basis of the simple every-day struggles. The whole of our Party and mass work is made more serious by the many language groups, and by the Negro national problem.

Such a situation, however, requires that the Party today, much more than heretofore, learn and take into consideration in its policy, tactics and strategy the situation in the most important industries, large factories, trade unions and localities. Let us take, for example, the decisions of the 13th Plenum, which put in the foreground the getting of a foothold in the factories in the most important industries. Today it should be clear to every Party member, that these decisions can be carried out only if we completely reject speculation upon the spontaneity of the workers, and,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by means of earnest, systematic work on the trade-union and political field, win over, step by step, these decisive strata of the workers. This can no longer be done by general agitation. *For this purpose, we require a membership trained in the political and trade union field and good Party cadres of factory workers and trade union functionaries.* The lack of such a trained membership, however, is one of our greatest weaknesses. That is the reason why we hardly understand how to popularize the general slogans of the Party against capitalist rationalization, against the stagger plan, for the seven-hour day, against lay-offs, for state unemployment insurance, against the imperialist war, for the defense of the Soviet Union; how to select such "little" demands as are suited to the concrete situation of the factory or locality in question; and how to raise in a certain order these or similar general slogans in accordance with the general line of the Party. This requires a membership and a cadre of Party workers, having close connections with the masses, understanding our communist policy, possessing a certain theoretical foundation, which must be closely linked up with their practical experiences in the proletarian class struggle.

For this we need a determined turn towards overcoming the weaknesses on the theoretical field. This turn will also contribute to doing away with the lagging of the Party in our revolutionary practice, behind the objective possibilities of the revolutionary upsurge. This is a question concerning not only the top functionaries of the Party, and the upper and middle functionaries, but a question of our entire Party work, from the Central Committee to the unit.

It is an old fact that the directives of the Central Committee on all political questions, traveling down to the smallest unit, go on a very long journey. Herein lies the danger that these directives, before they reach the membership, are often a little bit qualified, less precisely formulated, weakened, in certain circumstances, even a bit "changed," or, at times, completely lost. This is based in part on the difficulties and the tempo of the revolutionary mass work of our Party. An important safeguard against such events, however, is improved work towards raising the general theoretical level of the Party, general political education and strengthening of our cadres.

These facts show that the present Party workers must be increased and in many cases replaced as quickly as possible with *new forces* from the factories and trade unions. There is a stratum of the Party workers who do not understand the changed situation and the increased tasks and are also not capable of reorientating themselves, in order to apply new methods of Party and mass work, since they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are too strongly imbued with the old habits and traditions. These strata were useful in the period of agitation, but today in many cases they are a hindrance, if we leave them in the leadership of our Party committees. The Party must, however, continue to utilize their agitational abilities. Their orientation is often directed to the best-paid groups of workers; they do not understand that the period of decline of capitalism and the present economic crisis has brought with it a complete change in the composition of the proletariat, which was still further strengthened and added to by the results of capitalist rationalization.

In those Party organizations in the leadership of which these Party workers are still a majority, it was not possible to introduce political life and to activize the Party, but on the contrary, it was precisely there that bureaucracy celebrated its greatest triumphs. In the sections led by such Party organizations, strikes of the workers either pass the Party by or are led in such a way that the reactionary trade unions get the upper hand and are able to strengthen their mass basis. In these sections, there is no revolutionary unemployed movement, or else a very weak one and in these organizations we have no Negroes, or very few, in the Party, and even then, only those who know the factory merely from the outside.

II

Thus we see that the problem of cadres is one of the chief problems of the Party. We must proceed immediately to the solution of this problem. Matters stand so that we are able to proceed with success in this important work. If we look at the Party registration, we find that we took into the Party in September, October and November, about 3,500 new members, of whom about 3,000 remained in the Party. The trend towards the Party thus exists. Also, the social composition of these new members is somewhat better than formerly, since most of these new members are workers, whom we have won over chiefly through unemployed mass work. Nevertheless, it must be said that the recruiting of factory workers is taking last place. The chief cause for this is the fact that we hardly bring our political campaigns to the factories at all. This is quite clear in the mobilization of the unemployed. We have not carried out the political line of the Comintern for the joint mobilization of the unemployed and of the factory workers for state unemployment insurance, although we have in America millions of part-time workers, which make the carrying out of this line easier.

In the preparation of the hunger march to Washington on De-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cember 7, only our youth organization in Detroit—out of the entire country—attempted to make contact with and mobilize these unemployed who had formerly worked in the Briggs auto factory. It was arranged that these factory workers conducted a several-hour strike in sympathy, while the unemployed demonstrated in front of the factory. But our Scottsboro and Mooney campaigns, as well as the election campaigns, have passed by the factories without leaving a trace. The factory units are in the last ranks in the Party recruiting.

In the present recruiting campaign, we must at all costs lay the chief emphasis of our political work and of our mass campaigns in the factories. Furthermore, we must abolish all lack of system and spontaneity in the practice of our recruiting campaign. We must look upon the winning of the best workers for the Party, as one of the most important of our tasks, and, further, a daily task. Every political campaign and every strike, in which we do not succeed in winning over thousands of workers, and particularly factory workers, including Negroes, for the Party, has brought only partial results.

The most important prerequisite for a break with spontaneity and for the transition to sustained, active recruiting work, is the creation of a broad non-Party active around the Party units. Every unit must become acquainted with, and try to influence, the most advanced and accessible non-Party and sympathetic workers in its factory, and also such workers in the ranks of the reactionary trade unions. By concentration upon the best and most revolutionary elements, our units must determinedly and steadily bring them closer to our work, draw them into all forms of mass work, into circles and groups for the distribution and reading of Party literature, into Party courses and into open meetings of the unit. This active of non-Party workers must form the chief source for the recruiting of new Party members.

The results of the Party registration, which are now at hand from the districts in New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, Dakota and Colorado, show plainly all the political and organizational weaknesses of our Party and mass work and bring to the fore the problem of cadres.

Of the 6,500 registered members in the above-mentioned districts, 2,550 are unemployed. Yet in 187 unemployed committees in these districts, we have only 96 fractions, of which a large number are not even active.

If we consider the trades of our members, we find that the workers of the most important industries, and above all of the war industries, are very feebly represented in the Party. Out of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6,500 registered members, only 65 members are railway workers; only 20 work in the chemical industries; in transport and on the docks we have only 76 members; in the textile industries only 61 members; 532 belong to the metal industries; and 147 to the mining industries. On the other hand, we have 618 clothing workers, 636 building trades workers, 161 office workers, 174 intellectuals, 118 petty shop-keepers and 486 housewives.

It must be stated, also, that among these 6,500 registered members, there are only 614 Negroes. But since in the Chicago district, there are 412 Negroes out of 1,700 registered members, there remain for the New York district, out of 2,350 registered members, only 74 Negroes. New York has, however, large Negro sections, particularly the Negro section of Harlem. And a large proportion of these Negroes are working in industry, and in the needle trades. Here there is unquestionably expressed an incorrect political line and an absolute lack of understanding on the part of our Party cadres, concerning the winning over of these important revolutionary sections of the Negroes.

The situation in the Cleveland and Detroit districts is similar. In Cleveland, out of 500 members, there are only 80 Negro members, and in Detroit, out of 450 registered members, only 33 are Negroes.

The age-level of the Party membership shows that the youth—and thus the most active portion of the workers—has come to us an entirely insufficient degree. Out of these 6,500 registered members, only 425 are under 25; this also shows that the Party does not really help in developing the mass work of the League, fuse itself within the mass campaigns of the Party. Only about 1,600 members are between 25 and 30, whereas almost 200 members are over 40 and 50 years of age, and even older.

These figures on the age-level of the individual Party members are in noticeable contrast to the length of time they have been in the Party. Out of the 6,500 registered members, more than 3,300 have been in the Party only since 1930. That is, more than half. But if we add to these figures the Pittsburgh district, we get the result that more than two-thirds of our total Party membership have been members of our Party two years or less, often only five or six months.

These figures show, in the clearest and most indisputable way, the necessity of improvement in our work of political education all along the front. These figures show that the problem of cadres is actually the most burning problem in our Party at the present time.

Among the figures of the Party registration, we must consider

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also the membership of the comrades in the trade unions, in order to be able to determine the political strategic mass value of our members and functionaries. We have already seen that the most important industries are very feebly represented in the Party, and that as a result, we have practically no foothold at all in the large factories. Whereas in the factories having 100 workers or less, we have 515 Party members, and in the factories having from 100 to 500 workers, we have about 250 Party members, in the factories having over 5,000 workers, we have only 70 members, in the factories having 3,000 to 5,000 workers, we have only 37 members, in the factories having from 2,000 to 3,000 workers, only 34 members, in the factories having 1,000 to 2,000 workers, we have only 47 members, and in the factories having 500 to 1,000 workers, 68 Party members.

As to trade union membership, these figures show a similar picture. Out of the 6,500 registered Party members, only 2,300 are members of any trade union, and of these, 1,650 are members of the revolutionary trade unions, and about 650 are members of the reactionary trade unions. But these figures grow even worse if we take, for instance, the Chicago district. This most important district of heavy industry has, out of 1,700 registered members, only about 400 comrades who are members of any trade union, and of these, 189 are in the revolutionary and 207 are in the reactionary trade unions.

In the Detroit district, out of 444 registered members, only about 150 members belong to any trade unions; 97 of these belong to the revolutionary and 55 to the reactionary trade unions. In the Cleveland district, out of 500 registered members, only 115 members belong to any trade union; 48 belong to the revolutionary and 68 to the reactionary trade unions. These figures prove that the factory and trade union work are the weakest points in our Party.

III

To what tasks do these figures of the Party registration point?

It is at once necessary, in the district and section committees, in the functionaries' conferences and in all units, to make a political estimate of the figures of the Party registration and make it clear to the whole Party, that our entire mass work, and especially, the carrying out of the decisions of the 13th Plenum on the line of our factory and trade union work, as well as the successes of recruiting of the best of these factory and trade union workers, depend in general upon our Party units, and particularly our shop units. If our units are organizationally weak, little-trained ideologically and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politically, and, as a result, little active, their mass work must be insufficient. Our units will then have only feeble connections with the masses of workers, and will not be in a position to carry on Bolshevik work for the winning over on a broad scale of the best workers for the Party. In supervising the work of the various organizations, the growth of the units, their recruiting work, must be one of the most decisive criteria for judging the general status of the organizations to be supervised and reported on.

Since an overwhelming proportion of our Party members have been in our Party only a short time, all Party units and their leading committees must be thoroughly informed about the special work with the new members. Concrete methods of such work must be worked out, taking into consideration the local peculiarities. In this work the chief emphasis must be laid upon making the new members organizationally strong in the units, *by increasing their political activity and improving the political content of the work of the entire unit.*

At the present time organizational and technical questions are taken up in our unit meetings almost exclusively, and these are often presented divorced from the political tasks of the Party. Where political discussions take place they are often very abstract, with too little consideration of the situation in the big factories, among the unemployed, in the reactionary trade unions. The trade union political problems, which are so pressing for our factory work, are pushed almost altogether into the background. Our units are therefore very often not in a position to conduct a concrete struggle against reactionary wage agreements in their factories, against lay-offs, against the carrying out of the stagger plan in their factory, or against capitalist rationalization and its extension by the employers. Our trade union and agit-prop committees should simply take a wage agreement of the reactionary trade unions in their field, and, on the basis of this document, *show the difference between our trade union policy and that of the reactionary trade unions.* The same thing must be done in explaining our struggle against the stagger plan and against capitalist rationalization.

The new Party members must, however, be informed of the practical forms and methods of work in the factory, under circumstances of terror by the police and employers, and must be informed also of the elementary rules of conspiratorial work. Furthermore, it is very necessary to have a correct division of Party functions among the new Party members, The struggle against passivity must be conducted politically, and all overburdening of the individual Party members must be avoided. We must strive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to draw these new Party members, particularly the factory workers and trade union functionaries, gradually into responsible Party work. All Party organizations can find instructions on the line on which this is to be carried out, in the *Inprecorr*, Nos. 59 and 60, 1930. It is advisable that the district and section committees take 8 or 10 factory workers, and conduct with them a course on the basis of these instructions, in order in this way to create instructors for future courses.

Besides drawing members into active Party political work, we must also carry out special measures to reach our members through Party political educational work.

In this educational work varied methods must be applied and we must differentiate between educational work for new members, general courses for the units into which sympathizers can be drawn, courses for middle functionaries on a district or local scale, education and drawing in of Party members, especially for short-term section schools. In this the structure of the section must be specially considered, since the structure of a section in New York is different from that in rural territories. It is necessary to have regular sessions for instructors and functionaries, in order to raise the level of the functionaries, to educate mass propagandists, whom we need to carry on the work of political education. The topics for these functionaries' missions must be placed in such a way that they run parallel with the daily work of our Party units.

Furthermore, our Party should proceed to carry out one or two sessions a month of political education. In these sessions of political education the members of our units and of our trade union fractions should participate, and likewise the members of the unemployed committees. It is also permissible to bring to these sessions of political education, sympathetic workers, especially members of the American Federation of Labor. Topics for such sessions of political education should be: Our basic revolutionary evaluation of the present crisis as a combination of the general crisis of capitalism with a cyclical mass and their mutual effects; the basic difference between our trade union political line and the policy of the A. F. of L., how we fight against wage cuts, against the effects of the stagger plan, against capitalist rationalization; how to conduct a joint struggle of the factory workers and the unemployed for unemployment insurance; what role strike struggles play in the present period; what is the social basis of social-democracy and of the American Federation of Labor in the working class; the connections between trust capital and corruption, and the connections of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor with these corrupt apparatuses of the trusts and of the state; the effects of this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

connection on the daily policy of the American Federation of Labor against the workers, etc. These sessions of political education should likewise be conducted in the form of seminars.

Very important, also, is the organization of schools for the unemployed. For this, we must know and consider very carefully the structure of our Party, its social composition, the changes in the figures on unemployment in the various Party districts, in order to be able to place concrete individual tasks not only for the districts in general, but also for the various sections.

A very important problem in carrying out this work of political education in order to draw new Party masses into active Party work and to win new cadres, is the training of propagandists. Only in this way can the problem of the quality of our work of political education be solved. In this matter we must take care that these propagandists have practical experience in mass work, particularly in factory and trade union work. We have two tasks: the immediate increase in the number of members that are drawn into systematic work of education, but at the same time the improvement in the quality of our propaganda work. It is not by any means sufficient to reach the various functionaries by single courses; the further education of our comrades must be placed upon the agenda for the immediate future. We need several hundred well-trained propagandists. This goal must be reached by the mobilization of the students of our district and national Party schools. Second, no district and section Party school must be concluded in which the problem of propaganda, with the aim of drawing in new propagandists, has not been taken up. Every one of these schools must be in a position to conduct political courses for the units, and educational meetings, by means of printed instructions.

In order to solve these tasks, it is necessary to attach to our agit-prop apparatus in the districts and sections of our Party, special propaganda commissions. The composition of these propaganda commissions must be such that one comrade is made specifically responsible for the work of reaching the new members and for the conduct of elementary courses. This comrade must work in close contact with the organization department. A second comrade is responsible for the organization and supervision of the political education sessions. Third, a comrade is to be appointed for the distribution of theoretical periodicals. We must immediately prepare simple course-material for elementary and unit courses, on the basic questions of the proletarian class struggle, above all, on the factory and trade union work, on our revolutionary strategy and tactics, and on organizational problems.

The conduct of this systematic propaganda work is the task of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the entire Party. Otherwise it is not possible to carry out the political development of our members and the systematic recruiting of new Bolshevik cadres for the conduct of our increasing political tasks, particularly upon the fields of our mass work, in the factories and trade unions. The solution of this problem is one of the most important prerequisites for the carrying out of the decisions of the XIII Central Committee Plenum.

Parallel with the systematic work of political education and propaganda, we must alter the system of our functionaries. We must make an end to a situation in which, in the first place, all Party members, if they choose, may participate in functionaries' meetings. But this is not the most important thing. In the place of the formal routine election of functionaries we have had up to now, we must establish the system of political examination and review of their activities as the basis for election of functionaries. The system of regular periodical political reports by the elected committees must be instituted. Only in this way will passive and incapable forces be at once replaced by new, active, revolutionary forces, alive to the process of the political mass work of the Party units, and only in this way will there be created the prerequisites for a positive, *Bolshevik self-criticism and the broadest collective work.* These are very important prerequisites for the training of new cadres.

IV

> "Since there has been a labor movement in existence, the struggle has been conducted along three lines—the theoretical, the political, and the practical-economic. In precisely this—so to speak—concentric conception, lies the strength and invincibility of the movement."—*Frederick Engels.*

Our Party has in the past few months had greater successes in the field of mass work. But this very improvement and deepening of our revolutionary mass work in the factories and trade unions, in the many strikes and in the unemployed movement raises new problems almost daily. All deviations in our practical policy, in our strategy and tactics, have their roots in theoretical deviations from the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, they show a certain theoretical uncertainty in the ranks of our Communist Party. We must, therefore, hand in hand with the political and organizational rise of the revolutionary movement, hammer out our correct political lines in determined struggle on two fronts. And this we must do by means of stubborn and systematic struggle with right opportunist conceptions and with left sectarianism, with all revisionist, vulgar-materialist and idealist remnants, as well as in struggle for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses and against the fascist development of the capitalist state and of its social props. But this is possible only if we understand how to apply in our political practice, the fundamentals of materialist dialectics.

The following points are particularly important for the consistent application of the Marxist-Leninist theory to political questions of the day:

(1) Estimation of the development of monopoly capitalism, the symptoms of its decline and of its parasitism, the growth of its contradictions, the hastening of the tempo of its break-up and of the possibility of its attempts to find a way out and to consolidate itself. The development of this theory, in contrast to the favorable prophecies which the social-fascists and all renegades from Communism make for capitalism. The confirmation of the Party line by concrete developments, such as the world crisis, etc.

These points were definitely established at the XI Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in dealing with the bankruptcy of the theory of social-fascism.

(2) Analysis of the possible political forms of the rule of finance capital and of the necessary connection between these forms with the development of monopoly capitalism.

(3) Analysis of the development of the mutual relations of the classes with one another. The special significance of class relationships in the present crisis following upon the social shifting within the working class as a result of rationalization and prolonged unemployment, also the changes in the middle class, the role of the middle class, and the mutual relations of its heterogeneous parts.

4. The agricultural crisis which is a very important factor in the continuous deepening of the present crisis, has brought forward sharply the great role of the farmers in the sharpening of the class relationships. The still existing neglect of our activities amongst the farmers, is linked up with the insufficient Leninist appreciation of the role of the farmers, with the consequent weak theoretical study of the agrarian problems in the U. S. An immediate change must be made in this field.

The difficulty that the Party had in seeing the importance of the slogan of self-determination for the Negroes in the United States, was due to the failure to understand the Leninist approach to the national problem. The lack of support to the struggles of the Philippines, Haiti and other colonial and semi-colonial peoples oppressed by American imperialism, is also due to insufficient absorbing of the Leninist teachings on the colonial question and show in practice the influence of Luxemburg's denial of the revolutionary role of the struggle of the colonial peoples against imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The present crisis which brings ever wider sections of the population under the yoke of monopoly capitalism, the importance of the farmers, and particularly the growing revolutionary role of the oppressed colonial peoples, places in the forefront the importance of the Leninist teachings of the *hegemony of the proletariat* as the leading class in the revolutionary struggles for the overthrow of capitalism.

(5) Concrete application of the Leninist theses in the trade union question for the revolutionary strengthening of our factory and trade union work, the overcoming of schematicism, which prevails on this particular question; relation of the trade unions to the political struggle; relations of social reformism to the revolutionary class struggle.

6. Against the Luxemburg theory of spontaneity and the automatic collapse of capitalism, the Leninist teaching regarding the leading organizational role of the Party, the importance of strategy and tactics, must be theoretically worked out and concretely applied to the present-day tasks of the Party. The revolutionary way out of the crisis must be linked up with the decisive role of the Party in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(7) Popularization of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, distribution of basic writings and educational work on a broad basis.

V

Yet we must not overlook the fact that social-fascism is at present busy developing a number of new "theories." Not only has Kautsky recently brought out new works, but the new "theoreticians" of the social-democracy are developing new philosophical theories, as, for instance, the ever-growing tendency towards "religious socialism." This theory is far more widespread in America than the Party as a whole guesses. I saw leaflets in the election campaign in Milwaukee, in which the social-democracy utilized this theory of social-fascism very cleverly to win over backward strata of the workers. Furthermore, a completely new reactionary theory of social policy and of labor relationships has been worked out. Also, let us recall the theory of the higher development of capitalism, of ultra-imperialism, its concepts on the national question, on the trade union question.

But of particularly great importance in connection with the growing radicalization of the masses, are the "theoreticians" of the Second International, such as Max Adler, who in his *Textbook of Historical Materialism* attempts to recognize historical materialism in a formal sense, but in reality wishes to popularize cleverly his idealistic philosophy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in order to win the majority of the working class, it is very important to defend the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism in struggle against the fascist ideology. It is precisely in fascism that every little political question stands in the closest philosophical relationship with the struggle against liberalism. Here it is noteworthy that the fascist ideology develops in the closest connection with the reactionary theories of the various religions. The churches, and above all the Catholic church, were raising their reactionary heads more boldly than ever. They stand in the forefront of the reactionary struggle against the Soviet Union, as is shown by their great campaign against "cultural Bolshevism." (Father Cox's hunger march, the furious campaign of the entire bourgeois press in the Kentucky strike region for the ostensible defense of the religious sentiments of the workers, in order in this way to draw them away from the influence of the revolutionary trade unions and of our Party.) All opponents of revolutionary materialism gather at the knees of the church, and the social-fascists land there also on their road to "religious socialism."

We underestimate the role of national fascism. It is not enough to expose its demagogy; we must analyze its ideology, exactly as in the case of social fascism. With the exception of Marxism-Leninism, nowhere is philosophy so closely connected with practical policy as in the case of national fascism. The difference lies "merely" in the fact that in Marxism, theory and practice form indivisible whole, whereas in the case of national fascism, the contradiction between theory and practice makes them diverge widely from each other. This arises from the fact that national fascism takes its stand on such "absolute" truths as race, national honor, heroism, mysticism, belief, religion. That is the basis for the objective dishonesty and the subjective demagogy of its leaders. To lay bare these relationships, and to explain the social-economic basis of this ideology, is the more important, since national fascism is not merely politically, but also philosophically, the strongest source of all reaction, of idealism and of popery. A comparison with Italian fascism is very informative, not only as to the role of its ideology, but also for the mendacity of its various forms of development.

Finally we must mention also such questions as the harmful influences of bourgeois society upon the working class, which are based upon its incipient decay, whose tendencies towards dissolution we can note day by day. These influences exist on the most varied fields, and often show themselves in so-called "details" of daily life. Let us mention only the question of morality, the conceptions of sexual questions, etc. With the dissolution of bourgeois morality, for example, how much has been accomplished, but no-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing won. To stick at that point is un-Leninist. The revolutionary struggle requires that we oppose to this, a proletarian morality, which not only grants rights and freedom, but also, and above all, lays upon the class-conscious worker a hundred times as many duties in the service of his class. Let us remember in this connection such tendencies as Freudism, which exercises devastating influences. We may often observe how Freudian and Marxist views stand side by side, Marxism being formally recognized, which, of course, leads in all cases to an inner revision of Marxism.

These are some of the most important questions which we must tackle by planned theoretical educational work, in the closest connection with our daily mass work. But from the inevitable close connection of our theoretical work with revolutionary practice, arise our concrete theoretical tasks. The Marxist-Leninist theory, as the teaching of the conditions of the liberation of the proletariat, requires that our tasks never be general, but always concrete, prescribed by the special conditions of the liberation struggle of the proletariat.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Growing Revolt in Japan

By NAKATA

I

JAPAN is a land where feudalism (monarchy and semi-feudal exploitation in agriculture in which half of the Japanese population are engaged) and modernism (the most highly developed monopolist capitalism) rule in intertwinement; where the bourgeoisie and the landlords exploit and oppress the majority of peoples by means of the semi-feudal monarchist state apparatus. The Japanese ruling classes, like the British, are the typical parasitic imperialism which depend on the robbery of the workers and toiling peasantry not only in their home country but also in colonies and semi-colonies. For Japanese capitalism has grown without the essentials for its development at home except for semi-colonial cheap labor power: a gigantic cotton spinning industry without producing even a handful of raw cotton; a big heavy industry without iron and sufficient coal; a first-class militarism without materials necessary to war (iron, oil, salt, etc.); an enormously expanded industrial productivity and a huge accumulation of capital in the hands of financial magnates without a corresponding home market; an exceptionally dense population without land enough to live on. Exceptional rapacity and greed for raw materials and foreign markets on the part of its capitalists characterize aggressive, war-like Japanese imperialism throughout the whole history of its 60 years of development.

This profound contradiction in the structure of Japanese capitalism has been sharpened in the extreme owing to the present ever-deepening economic crisis. This is the reason why Japanese imperialism has carried out this headlong military occupation of Manchuria at the present moment.

II

The Japanese economic crisis interwoven with the agrarian crisis began in 1929 as an integral part of the world economic crisis. In spite of the optimistic prophecies by bourgeois economists, the situation has been turning from bad to worse without any sign of recovery. The bourgeoisie are trying to find the way out of the crisis by shifting all of its burdens on to the back of the workers and peasants on the one hand, and by aggressive imperialist expansion on the other hand.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are about 5,000,000 industrial workers in Japan. A half of them are factory workers; and a half of those factory workers are composed of textile women workers who are generally under 23 years of age. The crisis snatched employment from more than one-third of the total workers, exceeding 2,000,000. Wages of employed workers have been sharply and systematically cut. Before the crisis, the wages of Japanese workers were on a starvation level. The average amount of wages per hour was only 14.- sen (roughly 14 farthings). That of cotton spinning girls was 9.8 sen; they worked in two 12-hour shifts with one hour off for meals, earning from 50 sen per day to a maximum of 190 sen, but the majority received less than 80 sen. Wages of men were by no means high; more than one-third received less than 1.60 yen.* As a result of the crisis those wages have been cut, bringing them down to between 30 to 40 per cent lower than before the crisis. This is only the average wage though. In the Nagano Prefecture, for instance, there is a regulation of a minimum wage for silk filature girls of 1.35 yen monthly. However, these workers are lucky, because they still receive some money. In January of last year 111 factories in the same prefecture alone ceased paying any wages, affecting 23,500 workers, the loss of wages amounting to 580,000 yen. Thus, during the year 1930 alone, the capitalists squeezed out of the working class over 600,000,000 yen, merely by the reduction of wages.

According to the bourgeoisie, the cotton industry is the "flower" of Japanese industries, because this industry is realizing yearly the highest profit. It must be remembered, however, that this "flower" is fertilized by the blood and sweat of tens of thousands of young working girls. The majority of these working girls are confined in dormitories inside the high walls of the factories under the absolute control of their employers, making the organization of trade unions almost impossible. "The dormitories were like pigsties," wrote a British observer, "the same rooms being used by the day and night shifts, and only one mat space being provided for each girl. Consumption was rife, and after three years a girl was always unfit to work any longer. The food was edible but poor: rice and some vegetable for each meal, with fish and tinned meat once a week. For this they were paid 12 sen a day. . . . The girls did not dare return home (because their homes are more miserable), and so they either got work at another (worse) factory or became prostitutes. . . ." (*Lancashire and the Far East*, by Freda Utley.)

---

* 1 yen equals 2 shillings; 1 sen equals one-tenth yen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a song sung by the girls at work, which expresses their feelings:

Our home is dark with poverty;
Though I am only twelve years old
They sold me to a joint-stock company;
I slave in the factory for a few sens!

This is the real life and picture of the workers in the most highly developed imperialist country of the Orient. This is the "secret" of the rapid growth of capitalism in that country.

III

Turning to the villages, Asiatic and feudal poverty and misery are overshadowing the whole country life. There is an agricultural population of 27,000,000, which is 48 per cent of the total population of Japan. Eighteen per cent of the total agricultural population are the parasitic landlords who do not labor at all, though these possess 46 per cent of the best land. Nearly 70 per cent of the peasantry are the poor peasants who toil on the land belonging to the owners. The majority cultivate between one and a half acres to two and a half acres. Most operations are still carried on by hand with the same primitive implements and by the same methods as in feudal times. Large-scale methods of production, tractors, or combines are unknown to Japanese peasants. They work on a tiny bit of land the whole day, from the early morning till late in the evening, mobilizing all members of their families. For what? In order to pay, as tenancy rent, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the harvest to their parasitic landlords in kind (rice) as in the feudal age, otherwise their land is forcibly wrested from them by the judge or the police.

Last year the cost of production exceeded the price of rice by 37 per cent. Therefore many families have to depend to a large extent for their living on the earnings from their sons and daughters, which they send home every month from the mills in the towns. But the present crisis is throwing these workers on the streets, and they are being forced to return to their villages. As a result of the present crisis the peasantry lost during one year 1,250,000,000 yen by the fall of prices of agricultural products and 312,000,000 yen by the reduction of wages. The position of the peasantry is becoming radically worse and worse. Villages are overflowing with unemployed workers. They cannot eat the rice they themselves produce. Literally they are starving. The death rate in the country is rapidly increasing. The Japanese peasantry are exploited and oppressed by the semi-feudal methods of parasitic landlords, hand in hand with the bourgeoisie. But they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have begun to revolt against their oppressors. Spontaneous riots are becoming widespread in the villages.

IV

There is a pessimistic song of working girls:

I am a working girl; a poor little bird!
I have wings, but cannot fly;
There is the sky, but I am in a cage;
A bird with broken wings.

However, those girls have begun to sing a revolutionary song, the *Red Flag*; they have begun to break out from their cage. The Japanese working class have begun to fight for freedom from their capitalist chains. The strike wave, which had continued to rise since the world war, suddenly leapt up in 1930. A torch was lit by the young girls at the Hyogo Mill of the Kanegafuchi Cotton Company, employing 3,000 workers. This extended to other cotton mills, and then to other industries, such as metal, shipbuilding, chemical, mining and transport. At present the wave is sweeping over industrial towns. During the first half of last year occurred 1,079 labor disputes, involving 84,044 workers. These figures are the highest on record in Japanese history. They are not only the biggest in number, but also the most stubborn, the most revolutionary in character. The striking workers to an ever greater degree are breaking through the framework of legality, in spite of the reformist leaders' opposition. There is practically no strike waged without bloody collisions with the police, fascist gangs and strikebreakers. In a number of cases the workers have seized the factories (Fushimi Weaving Mill, etc.) and erected barricades there (Sumitomo Steel Works, etc.). Street fights have often been fought between the strikers and the police (Toyo Mousseline Works, etc.). At every strike mass arrests are general: for example, 200 at the Fushimi strike, 3,500 at the Sumitomo, 800 at the Toyo strike. The organized workers are beginning to free themselves from the influence of the reformist leaders; the revolutionary opposition in the reformist trade unions is rapidly growing. The influence and the numerical strength of the revolutionary trade union center, *Zenkyo*, a section of the Red International of Labor Unions, is steadily increasing.

Turning our eyes to the villages, there also we witness the open bloody revolts of peasant masses against the landlords and their police. Peasant disputes, amounting to 1,523 cases during the first half of last year, indicate the highest on historical record. The starving peasantry demand a reduction of tenancy rent or

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refuse to pay any rent to the land owners, with the support of their fellow peasants and often under the leadership of peasant unions. Against this the land owners resort to the court and the police in order to snatch the crops or land from the peasants. In the end, both forces come into collision. At Mayedamura (Akita) a few hundred armed peasants fought during three days (November, 1929) against the police and hired gangs. At Okanbara (Niigata) hundreds of peasants in June, 1930, assaulted the landlord's house, resulting in mass arrests (80 peasants). Nearly 1,000 peasants were arrested in Yamanashi in March last year. These are, however, only a few examples. The struggles of the peasants go far beyond the limit of legality. The demand for the reduction of tenancy rent has ceased to be their central slogan; the slogan, "Land to the Peasants," is becoming their central immediate slogan. The young masses in the reformist Peasant Unions are coming toward the revolutionary wing under the influence of the Communist Party of Japan.

The urban poor, especially the lower officials, the employees and the students, are by no means unaffected by this social unrest and rebellion. They are discharged from their employment in masses (3,000 from the state railways, 1,700 from the South Manchurian Company, etc.). Their salaries are radically cut (*e.g.*, a cut of 5,000,000 yen from the yearly salary of state employees in May last). Against this the officials threatened the government to carry on a general strike. Students are becoming more and more radical; 42 per cent of the university graduates are faced with the prospect of unemployment. Students' "strikes" are becoming widespread over the country, including the students of elementary schools. Early last year 165 students were dismissed from the universities. "Study circles of Social Science" are illegally organized in every high school, in spite of the repression of the authorities. In August last about 100 teachers of elementary schools were arrested throughout the country, on the charge of belonging to revolutionary teachers' unions. The petty-bourgeoisie, who are one of the chief bulwarks of capitalism, have begun to rebel against their masters.

Along with the rapid revolutionization of the working masses in Japan, the revolt of the oppressed peoples in Korea and Formosa against Japanese imperialism is steadily growing, in spite of the military terror of their oppressor. In Korea strikes and peasant fights are spreading; the Communist Party, the Young Communist League and revolutionary trade unions are winning influence among the masses in the teeth of a series of mass arrests. In Formosa, in October, 1930, the Musha tribe rose up in arms against Japanese oppression; in August last year 500 printers at Taihoku carried on a general strike; a Communist Party and a Young Communist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League began to be organized. The colonial and semi-colonial countries, which are the material basis of Japanese imperialism, have begun to revolt against their oppressor.

V

These economic struggles of the Japanese workers sometimes arise spontaneously and are carried on by the workers themselves or are led by their trade unions. At the end of 1930 there were 712 trade unions, with a membership of 354,312. However, the overwhelming majority of these unions are at present under the influence of the right and left reformist leaders. The right reformist unions support the *Shakaiminshu-to* (Social People's Party) which openly opposes Communism and adheres to the Second International. The left support the *Taishuto* (Mass Party) which veils its social fascist character with left phraseology. They are both birds of a feather. Recently they formed a "Labor Club" to fight against the radicalization of the masses.

Against the above there is an illegal national center of revolutionary trade unions, *Zenkyo* (National Council of Trade Unions), which adheres to the Red International of Labor Unions. The *Zenkyo* is composed of 11 important industrial unions, with a 15,000 membership. Under its leadership there are revolutionary opposition groups in the reformist unions. The Japanese government now concentrates its fire on the *Zenkyo*, because it is not only the central leadership of the revolutionary trade union movement in Japan, but also the strongest link between the Communist Party of Japan and the broad masses. At the end of August, 1,500 militant workers were arrested at Osaka, Kobe, Kyoto and other towns, as a direct preparation for a military invasion of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria.

Part of the peasants are organized in various peasant unions (4,225 unions, with 300,105 membership). But the majority of unions are under the influence of the reactionary leaders. The National Peasant Union is the biggest union (50,000) and leads the struggle of the poor peasants. At least half its members are under the leadership of the revolutionary wing.

The Communist Party of Japan is the center and leader of all these revolutionary movements. The Party was established illegally in 1922. Its subsequent history tells of incessant terrorist repression on it and of its persistent reorganization. There are at present 2,000 members in jail. They were all arrested under the anti-Communist "Peace Preservation Law," which can punish all Communists with sentences ranging from two years' imprisonment to the death penalty. In Japan almost all workers' organiza-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions under the influence of the Party are forced to be illegal. For example, the *Zenkyo*, M.O.P.R., Anti-Imperialist League, Anti-Religious League, as well as the Young Communist League, are illegal or semi-legal.

The Communist Party, basing itself on the thesis of the Communist International, makes its central task at the present stage of the Japanese revolution, the carrying through of the bourgeois democratic revolution—the overthrow of the monarchy and the completion of the agrarian revolution—which must be transformed *immediately* into the proletarian revolution. The chief motive force of the revolution is the proletariat and the poor and middle peasantry. The Party is now rousing and organizing all the revolutionary democratic forces of Japan under the slogan, "People's Revolution for Rice and Land, for a Workers' and Peasants' Government." In spite of medieval repression and terror of the police-monarchist government on the vanguard of the working class, the Party is spreading and strengthening its influence among the masses. It organized illegal mass demonstrations on Unemployed Day, anti-War Day, International Youth Day, etc. It has been leading and organizing the revolutionary fights against the occupation of Manchuria by Japanese imperialism. The *Pravda* said in its article (September 26), "The arrest of 31 organizers of the demonstration against imperialist war which took place in a suburb of Tokyo shows the real attitude of the advanced section of the Japanese proletariat to the occupation of Manchuria." The Japanese Party put forward the following slogans in an appeal which was widely distributed among the workers and the peasants: "Down with Japanese Imperialism"; "Defend the Chinese People and the Soviets"; "Defend the Soviet Union"; "Turn This War into the Civil War"; "For Soviet Japan."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Year of Sharp Class Struggles in Canada

By SAM CARR (*Toronto*)

A NEW YEAR is beginning. Nineteen hundred and thirty-one has terminated and we can summarize it as a year of sharpening and growing class conflicts in the history of struggles of the Canadian working class and poor farmers against their exploiters.

The background of the developing struggles was, and still remains the steadily deepening economic crisis which in the last few months, started to deal directly blow after blow at the financial and monetary system of the country.

At the end of 1930, in its New Year's "confidence" campaign, the bourgeoisie of Canada together with its economists, press, and the native participation of the social fascists, "prophesied, predicted, and assured" the people that the bottom of the crisis had been reached, and that better times will be ushered in by the year 1931. In the ushering in of 1932, however, the capitalist press admits that 1931 was one of the blackest years in the history of the industrial and economic development of capitalism on the North American continent.

THE STRUGGLES OF THE UNEMPLOYED

In January, 1931—the army of unemployed in Canada numbered 350,000. During the past 12 months this number has been doubled, thus bringing unemployment into practically every Canadian working class home.

At the beginning of 1931 the revolutionary movement in Canada, under the leadership of the Communist Party and the Workers' Unity League, started an energetic campaign of organization for struggle against starvation. The National Unemployed Workers Association has spread its branches throughout the country.

As a result of the militant struggles of the N. U. W. A., the unemployed have forced the municipalities to give relief in the form of food and housing, and in some cases even cash. In many cities the N. U. W. A. and the W. U. L. lead strikes of the unemployed on relief work, winning better conditions.

The major campaign of struggle against unemployment during the past year was the campaign for non-contributory unemployment insurance. The bill demanding the enactment of such legis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lation signed by 100,000 workers all over the country and supported by numerous working class organizations, was presented on April 15, 1931 to the House of Parliament. The millionaire Bennett, the prime minister of Canada, who has won for himself the name of one of the greatest arch-reactionaries in the world, declared "that there will be no insurance of any kind." The sharp clashes with the authorities in all Canadian cities, and the response of the army of unemployed to the call of the W. U. L. forced the bourgeoisie and the lackeys of the ruling class, the social fascists, to change their position on the question of unemployment.

Whilst prior to the presentation of the bill by the W. U. L., unemployment was considered in the ranks of the capitalist class as something that is not to be discussed, and while Mr. Moore, the reactionary leader of the American Federation of Labor in Canada, declared in unison with the bourgeoisie, "that he was against any conferences on unemployment since this would magnify the issue . . .," the struggles of the unemployed forced these gentlemen to change their position and unemployment became not only in practice, but this time also in Canadian politics a major issue on the agenda.

R. B. Bennett promised a system of contributory unemployment insurance. Pending the enactment of this ("some time before 1935") various schemes were to be worked out to "create work." However, when in the month of July, Bennett published his now infamous "starvation budget," there was not a cent provided for relief to the unemployed. In an attempt to divert the masses of workless from the revolutionary battles under the leadership of the W. U. L. and Party, the registration of unemployed started. All were to get jobs. In a short time 530,000 unemployed men were registered, in spite of intimidating, deportation and threatening questionnaires. Unemployed working women were not registered at all. Then started the wholesale distribution of hokum about jobs to be given to all unemployed on the construction of the Trans-Canada Highways. This latest bubble blew up rapidly when it became clear that only 18,000 men were given jobs in the semi-military camps on the highway construction, making no change in the deplorable situation of unemployment.

New Year's, 1932, finds tens of thousands of unemployed who have given up all hopes, once cherished to get a job. In spite of the protective tariffs, in spite of the attempts to create work, employment dropped in December by over 4 per cent. In the textile industry the increased tariffs resulted in more orders and more profits, at the same time employment dropped by 7,000.

Tens of thousands of unemployed are facing death from hunger and winter exposure. The municipalities are bankrupt. Relief is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being more and more cut off. Out of the $27,000,000 expended by the government on relief, the greatest part went into graft and profits for the contractors.

The struggle of the unemployed at the beginning of the New Year, despite the tremendous terror and persecution, is being continued. Hunger marches will take place in February. The National Unemployed Association recognizes its organizational weaknesses and is rapidly reorganizing the N. U. W. A. to include broader numbers of workers, through the medium of unemployed block and neighborhood committees.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST WAGE CUTS AND THE FORCING DOWN OF THE WORKERS' STANDARDS

Simultaneously with the continuous increase of unemployment, part-time employment became the lot of thousands of workers who are still "employed," but whose standard of living was thus forced down tremendously. The bourgeoisie in its attempts to preserve its sacred profits, resorted to a wide wage slashing campaign. There is not a single industry in Canada which did not feel the results of this.

The wage cuts were imposed under the "cloak" of helping the country out of the crisis by reducing "the costs of operation" (obviously at the expense of the workers). The bureaucracy of the reformist unions, together with the social fascist henchmen in the federal and local governments, openly supported the wage cutting campaign, accepting the same principle of "reducing the cost of operation."

The workers have given a decisive answer to the wage slashers in 1931. In spite of the opportunist talk of the impossibility and futility of strikes in a period of deep economic crisis, the number of strikes in Canada steadily increased. During the month of October, 1931, there took place 16 strikes involving 3,072 workers and causing a loss of 38,529 working days as compared with 10 strikes involving 2,240 workers and a loss of 9,900 days during the corresponding month one year ago. When we will have the possibility to compile the figures for the entire year, they will undoubtedly show a tremendous rise in the strike struggles in Canada.

The Workers' Unity League and the revolutionary unions have established themselves as *the* leaders of the economic struggles. The reformist bureaucrats on the other hand, have exposed themselves openly in preventing a number of strike struggles and in betraying a number of strikes where the workers struck in spite

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them (Bachus Mills, Montreal Light, Heat and Power, Florence miners in N. S., etc.).

The W. U. L. not only led 80 per cent of all strikes that took place recently, but also discredited the theory that strikes cannot be won in the present period of the crisis. The successful strikes of the Estevan miners, B. C. saw mill workers, Winnipeg metal workers, Ontario lumber workers, as well as the struggles of the furniture workers, fishermen, brick makers and clothing workers prove that strikes can be won in a period of crisis, when under militant leadership.

In spite of the many mistakes committed by the W. U. L. leadership in these struggles (Estevan, Winnipeg, Toronto), they marked a historic development of the class consciousness of the Canadian workers, and have shown the preference of revolutionary leadership as compared with reformist leadership.

The bitter struggles of the Saskatchewan miners who maintained their fighting ranks even after the bloody massacre in Estevan (resulting in three miners murdered and 20 injured) followed by the arrest of the entire strike leadership; the winning of the strike of the 700 saw mill workers in Fraser Mills (Vancouver) after two months of bitter struggle against the combined forces of the employers, state, and reformists, the solidarity of the white and oriental workers, fighting shoulder to shoulder, defeating all attempts to introduce race prejudices and thus break the strike, all these prove that under the leadership of the W. U. L. the Canadian workers rapidly learn to use more and more the effective strike weapon.

A very gratifying feature of all recent strikes was the active assistance by the unemployed workers to the strikers, as well as the fact that in spite of the thousands of jobless workers the employers had greater difficulties in securing scab labor than ever before. This drives another nail in the coffin of the opportunist and reactionary theory that strikes cannot be won because of the unemployed providing a reserve army of scabs. It has proven that under revolutionary leadership, even after major mistakes were committed, the unity of the employed and unemployed workers and their mutual assistance in struggles *can* and *must be* achieved.

The struggle against wage slashing and lowering standard of living is drawing in new strata of workers. The running trades of Canadian railways, the upper strata of the working class, is now feeling the attack. The 10 per cent wage cut was put into effect whilst the reactionary leadership is still "negotiating." In spite of the reformists, however, lodge after lodge is now rejecting the cut. Providing the left wing develops its recently started campaign among the railroaders, uniting the masses of unemployed shop

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men and the running trades workers, we may witness in the nearest future a struggle on the railways which have not seen a strike since 1921.

The mines in Nova Scotia are faced with a proposed 12 per cent to 33 per cent wage cut, and here too, the left wing must prepare the miners not only for a struggle against the operators, but also for a blow to the American Federation of Labor and United Mine Workers of America bureaucracy which assembled already in full force for the betrayal.

Under the shouts of better times and prosperity coming, the bourgeoisie is preparing the most vicious onslaught upon the living conditions of the workers still employed. This coming year will witness greater strike struggles in spite of the increased terror and intimidations.

THE DISTRESS OF THE FARMERS

The agrarian crisis hit hard the agricultural sections of the population during the past year. The official sources of the government had to admit that 300,000 of the farming population in Canada were in the actual position of starvation and needed immediate help in food and clothes.

In spite of the attempts to hold back to a certain degree the wholesale mortgage sales and foreclosures this year and thus avoid the throwing of tens of thousands of homeless farmers of Canada into the cities—thousands more of the farmers in Canada fell victims, an easy prey to the mortgage companies.

The case of one farmer in Ontario, a "good citizen" who was driven by the mortgage companies to suicide and whose last act in this world was to burn down his farm to prevent it from falling into the hands of the mortgage sharks, is very symptomatic of what is taking place among farmers as yet not touched by the activities of the revolutionary farmers' organizations, the Farmers' Unity League.

The recent rise in the price of wheat which was a result of the anti-Soviet agitation and the openly expressed hopes of the Canadian bourgeoisie "that Manchuria may mean the beginning of a war which will help Canada to come out of the present crisis," did not bring any relief to the farmers. It helped to increase the profits of the Richardson and Alberta Pacific grain elevator sharks.

The farmers of Canada, with the steady fall in the farm products (dairy gardening, etc.), face the year 1932 with very little hopes of returning "prosperity."

The Farmers' Unity League is carrying on a mass campaign for the Farmers Relief Bill. The district conference of the Farm-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers' Unity League as well as the work of the Farmers' Delegation which recently returned from the U. S. S. R. will undoubtedly help to develop the struggling front of the poor farmers, who in the recent strikes (Estevan, Vancouver, etc.) helped the struggling proletarians both morally and in the form of free food supplies, making the first steps in the direction of unity of the workers and the farmers in the immediate struggles.

THE PARTY GROWS, THE WHITE TERROR REACHES AN UNPRECEDENTED HEIGHT

The year 1931 marked important developments for the Canadian Communist Party. The Plenum of the Central Committee in the month of February, 1931 orientated the Party towards the economic struggles of the workers and away from the isolation and petty factionalism which permeated our ranks before.

As a result of the Plenum and the assistance of the Communist International in directing the Party towards the immediate struggles of the workers—we had the tremendous advance of revolutionary class front under the leadership of the Party. The Party membership increased during the year by about 50 per cent and the Party organization for the first time started to penetrate into shops and mines, establishing Communist shop groups.

Not only in the field of immediate economic struggles and the development of the revolutionary unions and the revolutionary trade union center, but also in the field of work among the many national groupings in Canada, we can record advance which expressed itself in the building of new mass cultural organizations and in strengthening of the existing ones.

Because our Party is the leader of the workers in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, because *it is the only anti-capitalist Party* in Canada, the whole brunt of political reaction fell upon it.

From a country of parliamentary democracy—where the Party was functioning legally as recently as in the year 1929—Canada in the period of the present crisis and especially since the coming into power of the government of bankers under R. B. Bennett, rapidly went through the process of abrogating all rights of the workers, introducing a campaign of vicious anti-working class terror, culminating in the Estevan murders and in the outlawing of the Party in Ontario as a prelude to the outlawing of the revolutionary movement all over the country.

The year 1931 was a year of unprecedented white terror in Canada. As compared with the two hundred arrests in the year 1930 —over 700 class fighters were arrested during 1931. Over 119

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years of imprisonment was handed out to the 155 proletarians who were convicted by the bourgeois courts for actively partaking in the class struggle. Deportations reached an unprecedented height. Meetings of workers were smashed, working class literature banned and intimidation widely practiced to prevent the development of the revolutionary movement.

In the history-making trial of the Political Buro of the Communist Party of Canada, the prosecutor when replying to the question as to why the state has chosen the year 1931 to declare illegal a party functioning legally for over 10 years, openly pointed to the resolution of the E. C. C. I., recognizing the gains of the revolutionary movement and its important role in leading the front of counter-offensive of the workers.

The five- and two-year sentences, the outlawing of the Party, and the promise of the widest application of the arch-reactionary "Section 98" of the criminal code, did not bring about the results expected by the bourgeoisie. Since the trial the Party is rapidly reorganizing its ranks to face this illegality, continuing to lead the workers' struggles and increasing its ranks. The driving of our Party underground will not prevent it, if correct leadership is given to the membership, from further successfully challenging the system of exploitation.

The defense campaign led by the Canadian Labor Defence League has won new stratas of workers in the present struggle against the capitalist terror, for freedom of speech and the struggle for the legality of the Communist Party.

THE SOCIAL FASCIST HIGHWAY OF TREACHERY

The sharpening struggles have further driven the social fascists of Canada (reformist bureaucracy, I. L. P., Labor Party, etc.) into the open camp of the bourgeoisie.

Every revolutionary struggle in Canada found the bitter opposition and the disruptionist activity of the Woodsworths, Simpsons. Heaps, Moores, and the other members of the social fascist cliques.

When the Canadian government imposed its embargo on all Soviet products, it was Mr. Moore, the president of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress (American Federation of Labor section) who became the traveling agent of R. B. Bennett, charged with the "noble" task of defending this most vicious anti-Soviet act. It was in this case that we had the possibility to see Mr. Moore defending the embargo before a meeting of the Canadian Credit Men's Association in the palatial Royal York Hotel, at Toronto.

It was the "labor men" in parliament who helped the Prime

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Minister Bennett to put over his misleading promises of unemployment after having declared our demands for non-contributory unemployment insurance as "unreasonable." Mr. Abe Heaps, Labor member of parliament was the one to move the resolution for *contributory* unemployment insurance supported by the Conservative Party, although he knew that this was only a gesture.

In Windsor, Ontario, at a meeting of the same Mr. Heaps, a number of our comrades were arrested and later thrown into prison for 18 months for daring to expose the social fascist activities of the honorable gentleman.

During the entire trial of the Communist Party of Canada, under a section of the criminal code which was even hard to swallow for the parliament, which on five occasions voted its repeal, and which was only prevented by a narrow margin in the senate —the entire camp of the social fascists was non-commital. Only after the rank and file in the reformist unions in Hamilton and Toronto as well as other centers sharply protested, were resolutions passed at the Canadian American Federation of Labor Congress held in Vancouver. However, this did not go any further.

After the conviction of the eight leading Communists, the above mentioned Mr. Moore declared "that these men had a fair trial." Mr. Simpson (vice-president of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada) and a controller of the city of Toronto, declared to a workers' delegation "that he is *not altogether against section* 98 or in *favor of free speech the way some people want it.*" This open position of the social fascist assured for him the support of the capitalist papers for re-election to the $5,000 job of a city father.

Acting more despicably than the police spy Leopold, Mr. Abie Heaps commenced proceedings against the leadership of the Communist Party in Manitoba (Winnipeg), for so-called "slandering his good name" and made it possible for the police, acting on the basis of a warrant sworn out by this labor betrayer, to proceed with mass raids and arrests, and the confiscation of Party documents needed by the police in its preparation to outlaw the Party in Manitoba.

Mr. James Woodsworth, the reverent labor faker, does his share in betraying the workers' interests by adding his voice to the renewed anti-Soviet war agitation. This slave of the bankers utilizes his recent visit to the U. S. S. R. for a series of articles in the capitalist press, directed together with all other garbage press reports to undermine the growing confidence of the workers in the success of the Socialist Republic.

In Alberta, instead of helping to prepare the miners for the struggle against forthcoming wage cuts, the reactionaries of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

M. W. U. A. with the aid of the labor representatives, actively busy themselves with attempts to split the revolutionary Mine Workers Union of Canada, using to the limit the declaration of one of the Saskatchewan judges that also the W. U. L. and revolutionary miners' unions are illegal.

In Nova Scotia, whilst negotiations on the 12 per cent to 35 per cent cut are carried on behind the backs of the miners, the reformists and social fascist cliques distributed among the miners a ballot asking them to vote against the employment of foreign born workers in the mines. This is intended to divert the attention of the miners from a strike against the wage cut, and to split the ranks of foreign-born and native miners, making a successful struggle impossible.

These are, in short, the outstanding features of the "glorious record" of the arch-treachery and open fascist activities of the "Socialists" and "Laborites" of Canada. We are increasing the struggle against them. Greater and greater sections of the workers see their real role and as the support of the bourgeois press goes more and more to its devoted servants so do larger groups of workers turn away from the traitors. The year 1932 must witness greater struggles of the revolutionary movement against these agents of capitalism.

THE PROSPECTS OF 1932

The capitalist class is facing the New Year with a growing feeling of hopelessness. This is shown in statements of serious economists which penetrate here and there through the thick layer of propaganda "that prosperity is around the corner"; "Rainbow Editions"; and "Sunshine Columns" in the press, recording such facts of "gigantic economic importance" that a "chair factory will employ 25 more men," etc., etc. cannot cover up the statement of the *Financial Post* on December 26:

> *"A new low point on the present movement in Canadian business operations was reached during November, continuing the declining trend which has been in evidence since May,* 1929. *A moderate improvement was shown during the early months of the year* (1931) *but subsequently the decline was renewed. The drop in the index from the maximum in* 1929 *to the low point in November,* 1931 *was* 57 *points, or* 33 *per cent."*

"Prosperity is returning, just suffer a little more" is the cry of the ruling class to the workers, directed towards preparing their ideology to a new wave of wage cuts.

The *Financial Post,* however, openly declares that "External fi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nancial troubles dominate the world economy and *no permanent revivals are expected until settlement is assured.*"

So we have the open admission of the bankruptcy of the theory advanced widely that Canada's "prosperity" is coming in spite of all, and the admission that Canada is deep in the international tangle produced by the crisis.

The financial position of the country is hard hit. The dollar dropped to 76 cents, or 24 cents below its usual par value. In an attempt to prevent the threatening depreciation of the currency an order prohibiting export of gold without special license was put across. Now in connection with the falling rate of the Canadian dollar, a practical ban on export of capital has been imposed.

A deficit of $250,000,000 as compared with $75,000,000 of last year is on the agenda. The heavy tariff resulted in a certain uptrend in a few industries, but this gain was reduced to ashes by retaliations of the other governments. The latest admission of bankrupt policy is the Conservative government's move to lift the embargo on Soviet furs.

The coming year will be a year of further crisis. The bourgeoisie, knowing this, want to reduce the fighting ability of the working class and poor farmers who are again expected to carry the burden, by smashing their only political Party, the Communist Party of Canada. This is also a prelude to the growing preparations for war against the U. S. S. R. in which Canada plays an active role.

The Canadian workers must face the New Year, 1932, with the full determination to make it a year of sharper struggles against the starvation system. The Communist Party will, under the leadership of the Communist International, lead the struggle for the liberation of the Canadian workers and farmers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Theoretical Foundations of Marxism-Leninism

By V. ADORATSKY

(*Translation from the Russian by* L. KATZ)

(*Continued from last issue*)

III. MATERIALISTIC DIALECTICS AS THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF MARXISM-LENINISM

MATERIALISTIC dialectics is the decisive thing in Marxism. Lenin characterized materialistic dialectics as the "living soul of Marxism," its "fundamental theoretical basis." This shows, therefore, how important is the study of this most significant theoretical principle, the mastery of the dialectic for the purpose of utilizing it in the study of nature and society, as well as in the theoretical struggle and also in the sphere of practical leadership of the entire struggle of the proletariat and of its creative activities. The understanding of dialectic materialism is necessary for every communist because it supplies him with the indispensable theoretical weapon of revolutionary method. And this is equally important both for practical and for theoretical work.

The articles collected in the edition, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, Part I, give, as already stated, a general characterization of materialistic dialectics and their application to the study of nature, of the history of human society, and of human thought. From the works of Marx and Engels, from the masterful application of materialistic dialectics by Lenin, we should learn how to use this method. Lenin himself gave us an example of how to study the works of the founders of scientific Communism. He himself was engaged in a lifelong most profound, deep study of the works of Marx and Engles, constantly reading them over and over again, repeatedly taking up that study, especially at each new historic turn of events, at each new stage of the revolution, when it became necessary to solve new problems in a new manner. Lenin learned revolutionary materialistic dialectics from Marx and Engels and he repeatedly emphasized how necessary it is to study their works, in such a way for the purpose of drawing their lessons. But it is not enough to say that Lenin assimilated the method of Marx. He developed it further, he lifted it up to a new and higher level.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But what is dialectics? Hegel understood by dialectics the motion of the idea (thought) through contradictions, the course of its development toward the highest, the absolute spirit, and here Hegel emphasized, that such motion, development is a spontaneous movement, that every phenomena has its own motion, its own line of development—and that this spontaneous motion is the result of inner impulses driving forward such development. In ancient Greece dialectics was the name given to the art of arguing. During a chat, fruitful and rich in new thoughts, the opinions of those engaged in the argument undergo modifications; a new, a higher thought is being developed. By analogy, all motion through contradictions was generally called dialectic motion. In just that sense Hegel used the word "dialectic." He considered that throughout the universe motion of any kind takes place in exactly that manner through a struggle of opposites, a negation of the old and a creation of the new. This is precisely how development takes place.

But Hegelian dialectics is idealistic dialectics. Its basis is the motion of thought. In contrast to Hegel, Marx aplied dialectics in a materialistic way, he created dialectic materialism. Materialistic dialectics is that universal motion, that development through a struggle of opposites, that is taking place everywhere, throughout the universe, in nature, in society, and is reflected in human thought. Dialectic materialism is the world outlook and method of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, a weapon for the study and transformation of everything that exists. Dialectic materialism does not confine itself merely to theoretical studies, it embraces also revolutionary practice.

Dialectic thought strives to embrace all phenomena completely and from all sides. An opinion expressed about any particular single thing must of necessity be somewhat one-sided.

In a letter to Gorky dated November 29, 1909, written after a chat with one of the students of the school of the *Forward* fraction in Capri (A. Bogdanov was its head, politically a follower of the *otzovists*), Lenin said that his previous ideas of the Capri School proved to be one-sided.

> "Philosopher Hegel was correct, by god!"—wrote Lenin—"life moves on through a series of contradictions, and living contradictions are many times richer, more many-sided, more meaningful than is at first realized by the human mind. I used to see in that school *merely* a center of a new fraction. It turned out, however, that it is not true—not in the sense that it was not a center of a new fraction (the school was and still is such a center) but in the sense that this is not all, not the full truth. Subjectively certain people made of the school such a center, objectively the school really was that, but, aside from this, the school also acted as center of attraction for real advance-guard type of workingmen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> from the very depth of real life. And so it happened that aside from the contradictions between the old and new fractions, there has developed in Capri also the contradiction between a part of the social-democratic intelligentsia (elements with more or less educational training and the Russian workers, who are sure to bring the social democracy out on the right road *under all circumstances* and, no matter what happens, will bring it out, despite all the foreign gossipings and quarreling, stories, etc., etc." (*Leninski Sbornik*, No. II, page 416.)

We see from this example that there are always many sides in every phenomenon and in every thing. Turning our attention to some particular side we must not forget about the others, those temporarily out of sight or relegated to a secondary position, but which are quite capable of assuming very great significance in the contradictory course of further development. We must be able, taking into consideration the entire perspective, the relationship of all sides of the phenomenon in the course of its development, to grasp that most important, "basic link" for each given concrete situation, for each historic moment. The complexity of the phenomena of real life, their contradictory nature, their constant changes—all of this results in the fact that conclusions about them (which correspond with reality) cannot help but also contain contradictions and do not themselves forever remain unchanged. This, however, does not exclude, but on the contrary, presupposes clear and definite answers to questions pressing for solution at each given moment. Dialectic materialism teaches to take note of the contradictions of real life, to understand their significance, to study their development (objective dialectics). In accordance with this, the movement of concepts—subjective dialectics, when correctly reflecting reality, must correspond to what is actually taking place in the outside (objective) world, must not tear itself away from its basis. Consciousness should strive to adjust itelf to the movement (dialectical) of the reflected object.

The importance of the works of Hegel lie precisely in the fact that he for the first time in new philosophy brought forward (and partly solved) the task of studying the general laws of dialectics. The great service of Hegel lies in the fact that he bases his philosophy on the dialectic. Hegel (in the words of Marx) "was the first to give an exhaustive and conscious picture of its (the dialectic—V. A.) general forms of motion." However, it would be very incorrect to conclude from the above, that it would be possible to simply take the Hegelian dialectic and utilize it without any premilinary and quite fundamental modifications.

Marx himself said about his own method that it not only differs fundamentally from the Hegelian but "*it actually is the very opposite of it.*" For Hegel, says Marx—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "The thought process, which under the name of idea he even transforms into an independently existing subject is the creator of reality which represents only the outward expression of the idea. For me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else but the material transplanted into the human head and there duly transformed."

A very fundamental modification of the Hegelian dialectic, therefore, is obviously required. It is necessary first of all to "put it on its feet" in order to reveal the "rational kernel inside the mystical wrappings."

Engels also dwells on this question and elucidates it in the same spirit. In answer to the question—wherein lies the error of Hegel, Engels answers: in the fact that the laws of dialectics are not deduced by him from nature and history, but are bound to them as laws of thought." An extremely absurd notion is thus arrived at:

> "The world has to adjust itself in accordance with a logical system, which itself is merely the result of definite stages in the development of human thought."

And Engels points out that "this relationship must be turned upside down" and then will everything become simple.

> The dialectic laws, which appear so mysterious in the idealistic philosophy, will then immediately become simple and clear."

And in another place Engels points out that the mysticism of Hegel consists in the following:

> "The category (conception, idea—V. A.) appears in his works as something having a prior existence, the dialectics of the actual world being a mere reflection of it. Actually, however, it is just the opposite; the dialectics of thought are a mere reflection of the forms of motion of the actual world, whether of nature or of history."—F. Engels: *The Dialectics of Nature.*

Studying Hegel, Lenin as well as Marx modified Hegel in a fundamental manner, turned the Hegelian maxims inside out, placed them on their feet, gave them materialistic expression.

> "We cannot *apply*," wrote Lenin, "the Hegelian logic, in its given form; we cannot *take* it as such. We must *extract* from it the logical shadings, clearing them first from the *mysticism of ideas*; that still remains a big work." (*Leniniski Sbrornik*, No. 12, page 205).

Particularly important as text books for the study of Hegel are the outline of *The Science of Logic*, by Hegel (published in the *Leninski Sbornik*, No. 9, and the *History of Philosophy* by Hegel (*Leninski Sbornik*, No. 12).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Development within the universe is taking place not because of some outside force (god) and neither by virtue of the inner "rationality" of everything that is happening, but by virtue of inner contradictions, which are natural to all things and phenomena.. "Contradiction lies at the basis of all motion of all manifestations of life. Only to the extent a thing contains within itself a contradiction, does it move, does it possess impulse, does it show activity," —says Hegel. "That is exactly the way all motion, all development take place."*

In his note *About the Question of Dialectics* Lenin points out the presence of contradictions everywhere: repulsion and attraction, positive and negative electricity, subdivision into parts and combination of parts into one whole, etc. Contradictory, opposite, mutually exclusive, and simultaneously mutually attracting tendencies are to be found in all phenomena and processes of nature and of society. Dialectics, that is contradiction, unity and struggle of opposites take place in the material world itself and are reflected in consciousness.

The universal laws of dialectics are equally applicable everywhere—in the movement and development of the immeasurably tremendous volumes of light-emititng nebulæ, which form the entire system of heavenly bodies in the vast spaces of the universe (the distances within these spaces are measured in light-years, that is by the distance a ray of light, traveling at a rate of a speed of about 300,000 kilometers per second, traverses in the course of one year), in the realm of the internal structure of molecules and atoms, in the movements of protons and electrons, which are also simultaneously both opposite and mutually bound together, passing through transformations, changes, development, thus revealing in their existence and movement the operation of the same laws of dialectics.

Similarly through contradictions, through struggle of opposites the development in the animal world proceeds (struggle for existence, multiplication by sex, etc.).

In human society the moving force of development is the class struggle. Through the struggle of the revolutionary class, the proletariat under present-day conditions, the transition from one social order into another is taking place; one social form is changed for another, the transition from capitalism to Communism proceeds.

---

* In essence, such a conception was incompatible with the idea of the existence of god. The very alert priests that were in charge of spiritual education in Russia, very soon (in the 50's) realized therefore, that in the study of Hegel there are very dangerous elements, and a stop was put to the study of Hegel in the religious seminaries and academies despite the fact that the Hegelian philosophy is an idealistic one, that the concept of god is still there, though disguised under the name of absolute idea.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(We will dwell on this in somewhat greater detail a little later.)

Such dialectic motion within the material world constitutes the object of study of materialistic dialectics.

According to Lenin, "contradiction" is the salt of dialectics," (*Leninski Sbornik*, No. 9, page 289) "unity and struggle of the opposites—its kernel." (*Ibid.*, page 277.)

Alongside with contradiction, with opposites, dialectics emphasize also *unity*. This formula, "unity of opposites," is explained by Lenin as follows:

> "We cannot imagine, express, measure, or picture motion without putting a stop to the incessant, without simplifying, hardening, dividing up, deadening the living. The picture of motion in thought is always hardening, deadening and that is true not only of the thought but also of feeling and not only of motion but of *all* conceptions. And therein lies the *essence* of dialectics. And it is exactly *this essence* that is expressed in the formula unity, identity of the opposites." (*Leninski Sbornik*, No. 12, page 192).

The Greek philosopher, Zenon from Ella, who lived in the 5th century B. C.,), known as the father of dialectics, was the first to formulate clearly and precisely the idea of contradictions in motion. A few of his discoveries have reached us and there he elaborates on the idea that thought will inevitably get into a blind alley if one is not guided by dialectic methods and does not understand the principle of the unity of opposites. Here for instance is one such argument; an arrow in flight must occupy a certain point on its route, it takes up a certain definite place. But that implies that at each given moment it is in a state of rest, i.-e., does not move; and this is tantamount to a statement that in general it does not move. Thus we see: we cannot give expression to motion without resorting to expressing opposite conceptions. The arrow occupies a certain point and simultaneously does not occupy it. And motion can be expressed only by simultaneously giving expression to both of those opposite conceptions. Should we, however, stop at the middle, thus giving expression to only one half of the phase, there is sure to be missing either the motion or the object itself. The same is true with regard every conception, because conceptions express only one or several sides of the object, whereas in reality each object has an infinite number of sides, an infinite number of connections with the surrounding world. Therefore it is possible to give expression to opposite conceptions about every thing or phenomena and they will within certain limits be correct. Explosives used in war result in terrible ruination and desolation, but when applied in peaceful pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duction they serve the objects of culture. By virtue of class contradictions all things and phenomena are acquiring an opposite meaning to the embattled adversaries: to the proletariat the Soviet power signifies its victory, its development; to the capitalists—defeat, the end of their domination, etc.

The formula *"unity of opposites"* is of particular importance because it expresses the *basic, distinctive feature of dialectic motion, the most fundamental feature of all phenomena.*

Here, however, in order to avoid all possibility of misunderstanding, it is necessary to make the following reservation; the above should not be understood in a sense that we will be practicing dialectics once we try to arbitrarily combine any kind of opposite ideas. Unity of opposites should be understood not as a simple repetition of any kind of idea and counter idea arbitrarily brought together, but as such a particular dovetailing of opposites, and of their struggle, as is to be found in real life, as revealing of contradictions that act in real life as the moving forces, as the basis of motion.

* * *

In order to make clear the peculiarities of the dialectic method of thinking it will be useful to compare and counterpose the dialectic with other non-dialectical forms and methods of thought. This will enable us to explain the fundamental peculiarities of materialist dialectics in a more precise manner, to better round out the exposition of its laws and particularly its basic law: motion through contradictions, unity and struggle of opposites.

Dialectics are the opposite of metaphysics, eclecticism, the vulgar "evolutionary" understanding of development, and sophism. Materialistic dialectics are opposed to transplanting of ready made patterns and schemes. They require a deep study of the concrete, exact formulation of the actual course of development, and also of the revolutionary activity.

Dialectic thought is the exact opposite of the metaphysical, which views things and phenomena, not in their unity and connection, but as isolated from one another, outside the great universal connection of things and therefore not in motion but rather in a fixed state, frozen, unchanging, not living, but dead. Such (metaphysical) thought is incapable of reflecting the real connection and development of phenomena.

What attitude are we to assume, for instance, towards capitalism, or bourgeois democracy? If we approach those phenomena with one previously prepared answer, that will be a metaphysical approach. If we should say that capitalism is an evil under all circumstances

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—that would be untrue. Compared with serfdom, capitalism was a blessing; up to a certain point it gave freedom to the toilers, placed them in better conditions for their development, for struggle towards final emancipation. Serfdom was a blessing as compared with slavery. So long as serfdom exists, so long as it is the dominant form, any movement towards capitalism is a movement toward progress. But when the feudal owners are thrown off, then the workers have only one main enemy left and that is capital. Capitalism is a blessing in relation to the past, but in relation to the future, more perfect system—Socialism—it is an evil which must be destoyed.

For the proletariat the bourgeois democracy is, of course, better in comparison with the absolutism of the Tzar. The proletariat, therefore, cannot help but try by all means to overthrow absolutism. But the democratic republic—it, too, is one of the forms of class domination of the exploiters, of the bourgeois dictatorship; it must be supplanted by the Soviet state—proletarian democracy.

Slavery is an abomination. But slavery was necessary in the course of the historic development of humanity, long ago, at a definite stage of the development of production; in its time it signified a necessary stage of development, an advance. Instead of destroying the enemy, they were utilized, at a certain stage of development of production, as slaves, their labor power was saved and utilized.

If we are asked: why should we bother considering the facts of long gone-by days, then the answer is that development throughout the world proceeds unevenly. At one place (in the U.S.S.R.) the bourgeois democracy is a thing of the past, at another (outside the U.S.S.R.)—a thing of the present. And feudal relations, and even slave-holding relations (if not full-fledged, then remnants) still exist in Asia, in Africa and even in Europe and America. The basic contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the slavery of wage labor and the struggle against it, between the system of capitalist states and the U.S.S.R., is indeed supreme above all else and all-pervading for the present, but alongside with it there still remain the old forms of oppression. Humanity was compelled in the past and is still compelled to lift itself out of the primitive beastly state of semi-barbarian conditions, of the pinch of want, of oppression, darkness and ignorance by its own means without any kind of help from an almighty (who, we well know, does not exist). In this struggle for emancipation the proletariat plays the leading role. It conducts the struggle against the main dominating relationship of wage slavery, but alongside with that form of exploitation, the remnants of all previous forms of oppression are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still intact and against these the proletariat cannot help but conduct a very determined struggle.

Dialectic materialism is the guiding theory in this proletarian struggle. The proletariat fights against the bourgeoisie, eliminates it, overthrows its supremacy, destroys relationships of exploitation and at the same time assimilates and develops further all the conquests of culture that have been made during the reign of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois, the capitalist is our enemy. But, having done away with the domination of that enemy, and having crushed his resistance, we must utilize his knowledge, his experience, the culture and technique already achieved under the bourgeois regime; we must compel the bourgeois specialists to work under well defined, concrete conditions for the good of Communism.

In the course of development one condition is supplanted by another, everything is negated, but the distinguishing feature of dialectic negation consists in this, that it does not merely brush aside, but it eliminates, overcomes. Socialism cannot be built without working over and assimilating everything which was given up by previous historic development, everything that the bourgeoisie itself inherited from the past and developed. Such a dialectic negation of the bourgeoisie can be carried out only by the contemporary proletariat—the class that is intimately connected with contemporary large scale industry, the most valuable fruit of the bourgeois development.

We thus see, in every step, in every phenomena, that there is no such a thing as frozen state—everything changes, everything passes from one condition into another. And that is why metaphysical thought, that views things in their state of isolation as something not subject to change, does not reflect truthfully this never-ending process of motion and of mutual connection of all phenomena.

Development, as already stated above, proceeds through inner contradictions. For instance, the capitalist regime represents a unity of contradictions—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The dialectics of this contradiction is brilliantly illuminated by Marx in the *Communist Manifesto* and in *Capital*. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are opposites but at the same time they form a certain unity; they are classes of the same social-economic formation—capitalism; they find themselves in a position of an irreconcilable contradiction to each other. This contradiction must be solved according to the law of dialectics through an internal struggle, through the proletarian revolution. These laws are being created by the mass struggle. In the course of the revolution the proletariat transforms itself, and becomes educated to its historic mission.

> "A revolution is needed" wrote Marx in 1846, "not only because there is no other way to overthrow a ruling class, but also because

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> the class that does the overthrowing is able only through revolutions of cleansing itself of all the filth of the old regime and thus become capable of building a society."

That idea is one of the basic ideas of Marxism. Marx repeated it many times. Thus, in 1850 Marx said in his speech at a session of the Union of Communists, addressing himelf to workers:

> "You will be compelled to go through the sufferings of 15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and battles of people not only in order to change the regime but also to change yourself and thus qualify yourself for political supremacy."

And in 1871, in pamphlet *Civil War in France*, Marx again repeats the same idea saying that the working class knows:

> ". . . that in order to achieve its final emancipation, and to attain that highest form of life, towards which modern society is aiming irresistably by virtue of its own economic development, it will have to endure stubborn battles, live through an entire series of historic processes, that will completely change both men and conditions." (K. Marx, *Civil War in France*. 1871.)

We see here the same unity of opposites, a struggle of these opposites and the natural solution of this struggle through a transition to a new type of society. Without passing through a long and severe school of struggle the proletariat is not qualified to successfully carry out its historic mission.

The task of the materialist-dialectician consists in the thorough study of this struggle of opposites that is taking place in the world all around us, reveal it in the manner it actually takes place, find the dialectically correct basic contradictions, and not merely accidental eclectically (arbitrarily, outside of their natural mutual connection) snatched-out features and side-issues of a phenomenon, reveal the moving forces of development and take an active part in this struggle on the side of the revolutionary class, lead the mass struggles of the proletariat.

> "My ideals of building a new Russia," said Lenin, "will not turn out to be chimerical, only provided it expresses the interest of an actually existing class that is compelled by its very conditions of life to act in a definite direction. Expressing this point of view of objectivity of the class struggle, I do not at all justify reality; on the contrary, I am pointing out in *this same* reality the deepest (though unseen at first sight) sources and forces for its transformation." (Lenin, Works, Vol. XVI, *About the Political Line*," p.p. 143-144).

In eclecticism we meet with methods incompatible with dialectic materialism. Dialectics carry on war against the habit of eclectics

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to arbitrarily snatch out isolated features, against their inability to see a thing or phenomenon in its completeness, as a whole, in its full complexity and at the same time in its unity, in its natural and necessary connection and development just as it takes place in real life. To take in the entire phenomenon in its completeness, as a whole, in its full complexity, and and the same time in its unity, and its entirety, is contrasted with the one-sided exaggeration of isolated features, integral parts, and separate sides of the object. Materialistic dialectics require the isolation of that which is the most important at the same time paying attention precisely to those sides, which due to circumstances are brought forward to a place of importance, but at the same time it demands of us not to leave out of sight the entire phenomenon as a whole. Our conceptions should display a correct understanding of the relationship of the different sides of the phenonmenon just as they appear in reality, emphasizing those contradictions that are basic (isolating "the basic link," as Lenin used to express it, which is so important for the practical leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat). One of the great many examples of how Lenin criticized eclecticism is to be seen in what he had to say about the arguments of comrade Bucharin in the discussion about the trade unions. On this subject Lenin gave very exhaustive explanations in his article *Once More About the Trade Unions*. (Lenin Works, Vol. XXVI, pp. 109-145.) And as an example of skill in isolating the "basic link" and as very clear proof of the great importance of that skill for the success of the proletarian revolution the launching by our Party under Lenin's leadership of the New Economic Policy and the clarification by Lenin of the issues involved in all the measures promulgated in that connection, his analysis of all the phenomena accompanying this particular situation, all of it is very illuminating. (See Lenin, *About the Significance of Gold Now and After the Full Victory of Socialism*, Works, Vol. XXVII, pp. 79-85, and other articles in Vol. XXVII.)

In contrast to the eclectic way of understanding things, dialectics proclaims the teaching of *the concreteness of truth*. In his introduction to the *Critique of Political Economy*, Marx explains that the concrete is concrete by virtue of the fact that it combines within itself a multiplicity of factors, constitutes "unity in many sidedness." All nature, all reality that surrounds us is concrete, it combines within itself, contains, fuses together, all contradictions. Our knowledge advances in the direction of ever greater capacity to more completely and more deeply reflect this complex (concrete) reality.

Making due allowance for the limitations and conditional character of all abstractions, dialectic thinking, nevertheless, utilizes abstractions within proper limits. Abstraction isolates any one parti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cular feature, concentrates all attention on it, studies it. In his preface to Vol. I of *Capital* Marx notes that we can utilize neither the microscope nor chemical reagents in the study of social (in particular, economic) phenomena. "Both must be replaced by the power of abstraction." Marx, in Volume I, Chapter I of *Capital*, where he analyzes the basic phenomena of a bourgeois society based on the exchange of commodities, gives an example of how abstraction is to be utilized and what are the limits within which it plays an indispensable role in scientific investigations.

Of course, Marx does not limit himself to this alone, when he undertakes the task of giving a general picture of the laws of capitalistic society. When it comes to an analysis of the entire complex reality as it is, it is necessary to try and elaborate a picture so as to reflect this reality in the most exact manner, to work out the concrete truths that would reflect the real situation in all its completeness, in the unity of its contradictions and opposites.

In his notes, made while reading Hegel, Lenin said that "in concreteness lies the spirit and very essence of dialectics." In his popular explanation of the essence of dialectics (see the above mentioned pamphlet of Lenin, *Once More About the Trade Unions*, in Vol. XVI, pp. 109-145), Lenin pointed to the following as one of the most important demands of dialectic logic: "There is no abstract truth, truth is concrete." That means, that we must not limit ourselves to general conceptions, that life demands clear and exact answers to concrete questions which are brought forward by the historical development, by the struggle of the working class, that if we are to pronounce judgment about things as experts, we must be capable of reflecting, within our consciousness, all the relationships, all the complexity of the concrete surroundings of the given phenomenon, and reflect the general laws of its development.

The *dialectic* understanding of development, which reveals all the complexity of this process, is diametrically opposed to the vulgar, shallow understanding of "peaceful" development—"evolution"—without contradictions, jumps, shocks, revolutions. This last conception is altogether helpless when confronted with actual development. As a matter of fact, however, the true idea of evolution, which is in full agreement with reality, includes within its own limits not merely slow, gradual changes but also rapid ones, "jumps," interruptions in the gradualness. No phenomenon can be explained without the idea of "jump." Otherwise we would have to assume that there is no beginning to anything, that everything already exists in an infinitely small way and then grows very slowly. As a matter of fact, however, in reality we meet at every step with the phenomenon of the interruption of gradualness, of the appearance of a new quality which previously did not exist, of jumps. Supplanting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of forms always takes place in actual life by way of revolutions, of jumps. In the course of development there takes place the negation of old forms, the act of supplanting them with new ones and then the new negation.

Such a commonplace, every-day phenomenon, which repeats itself constantly, millions and billions of times, the phenomena of birth takes place precisely in that revolutionary way. And the bearing of the child within the womb of the mother is a process of slow, gradual change. Social developments takes place by way of class struggle and of revolutions. Dialectics give us a correct and deep well rounded out theory of development, assuming a complex, not straight road, including in it not only a growth of slow and gradual changes, but also periods of catastrophies, rapid breaking up, jumps, revolutions, movements in the opposite direction as if preparing for the next sprint forward, ebb and flow, etc. "Evolution" is pictured by the imagination of the bourgeois ideologists, is a simple, quiet, smooth process. Dialectics are difficult, complex, "tricky," (as Hegel expresses it); it is very difficult to understand and master such a motion, but how can we help it, when the structure of the real world and its development are complex and not as simple as some well meaning citizen might like to have it.

The dying off of the old and the birth of the new is always a complicated and difficult process. The course of development is always such that importance lies in the movement as a whole and not merely its result.

The idea that it is possible to obtain the fruit without first having labored long and hard to produce it is a self-deception. The fear of revolution, of its actual development when people get frightened and tremble in terror at those forms of struggle that life brings forth—all of this amounts in effect to a defense of exploitation, to a betrayal of the cause of emancipation of the working class from wage slavery, to a renouncing of Communism.

In a certain note dated in the beginning of 1918 Lenin explained the sense and significance of the class struggle of that period in the following manner:

> "Every time the bourgeoisie and its officials: employees, doctors, engineers, etc., who are accustomed to serve them, make use of extreme measures of resistance, our delicate intellectuals become terrified. They tremble from fear and shout still more shrilly about the necessity of a return to 'conciliation.' We, however, the same as all sincere friends of the exploited class, can only be satisfied with this extreme resistance of the exploiters because we expect a maturing and ripening of the proletariat for power neither through pleading and persuasion, nor through the school of sweet sermons and instructive declamations, but through the school of life, the school of struggle. The proletariat has to actually *learn* how to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become a ruling class and to completely vanquish the bourgeoisie, because there is no way for him to gain this ability all at once. And such training can be gotten only in struggle. Only a serious, a stubborn, a desperate struggle will give the needed training.

"The more extreme the resistance of the exploiters, the more energetic, rigid, unmerciful and successful will be their suppression by the exploited. The more diverse the attempts and efforts of the exploiters to maintain the old regime, the sooner will the proletariat learn to drive their class enemies out of their last hiding places, to destroy the roots of their domination, to remove the very soil which made possible the growth of wage slavery, mass poverty, profiteering and insolence of the money bag.

"In the same measure as the resistance of the bourgeoisie and its hangers on grows, the strength of the proletariat and of the peasantry that is allied with it also grows. The exploited gather strength, mature, grow, learn, throw off the 'ancient Adam' of wage slavery in proportion as the resistance of their enemies—the exploiters—grows. Victory will be on the side of the exploited, because they have in their favor life, strength of numbers, power of masses and the inexhaustible sources of all that is self-sacrificing, ideal, honest, all that is pushing ahead, awakening to the task of building the new, all the gigantic supply of energy and talent of the so-called 'common people,' workers and peasants. The victory is theirs." (Lenin, Works, Vol. XXII, p. 157, *Those Frightened by the Crash of the Old and Those Struggling for the New.*)

These lines giving an evaluation of the dialectics of the class struggle and written more than 10 years ago, still retain their significance. So long as the classes are not finally liquidated, until such time as class society is not destroyed, until that time the class struggle of the proletariat serves as the basic prerequisite for social development, the condition for the advance of society to a higher form of organization—to Communism. And those who do not understand this, who do not want to understand the necessity of this difficult road towards building up of Communism, and of a struggle for it, those that are frightened by these difficulties, and dream of avoiding them, trying to conciliate the exploited with the exploiters—all such are in fact enemies of Communism, because they hinder the masses of the exploited class from fulfilling their task, lead them away from that road that is the only way out of the clutches of slavery and society based on exploitation.

The unwillingness to take into account the actual and unavoidable course of things, mentally jumping over several stages which in reality have to be passed through—that also is a great sin against dialectics. Such jumping over and running ahead leads to isolation from the masses, and in practical politics, to the fact that the real leadership of the revolutionary mass struggle is given up (and precisely into the hands of the bourgeoisie).

Dialectics demand a clear definition of from what and toward

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what transition is taking place and clear distinction of the consecutive stages.

There are innumerable examples of how Lenin could masterly discern transitions. Let us point here to the world historical significance of the transition (transformation) of the imperialist war into a civil war—a transition that was not only studied and understood by Lenin in its full significance, but actually took place with the closest participation of Lenin. At the basis of this transition is the development of the proletarian revolution which is achieving the transition from capitalism to Communism through the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin studied the course of this development in all its complexity. In 1916 he wrote about the imminent socialist revolution, that it will be—

> "... an explosion of mass struggle of all and sundry oppressed and dissatisfied. A part of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will unavoidably take part in it—without such participation no *mass* struggle, *no revolution* is possible and, of course, just as unavoidably they will bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But *objectively* they will be attacking *capital* and the conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat, expressing this objective truth of a multicolored, disharmonious, motley and superficially disunited mass struggle, will find a way how to unify and direct it, conquer power, take over the banks, expropriate the trusts, so hateful to all (though for different reasons), and carry out other dictatorial measures that, in their sum total, will result in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and in the victory of socialism which, however, will not succeed in immediately *cleansing* itself of its petty bourgeois dross." (Lenin, Works, Vol. XIX, *Results of the Discussion on Self Determination*, p. 269.)

This scientific prophecy of Lenin has come true in its entirety. In all the works of Lenin of the period 1917-1923 we find light thrown on the whole series of questions connected with the task of leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat which is engaged in transforming of a capitalist system of exploitation into a classless communist society. In the course of a series of articles Lenin analyses the stages of the revolution, studies the transitions during the very period of transition, grasps the very essence of the phenomena which are transpiring, points precisely from what and toward what transition is proceeding, isolates the basic and essential points, takes note of the objective conditions in order to direct the mass struggle, to utilize all available forces for the development and deepening of the proletarian revolution, for the victory of the cause of the proletariat (see such articles as *New Times; Old Errors in New Forms; On the Significance of Gold at Present and After the Final Victory of Socialism*)—and we should be absolutely clear

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on this point, that only on the basis of the theoretical understanding of the revolutionary struggle that was taking place at the time did the leadership of the Party of Lenin assure the victory of the proletariat, the consolidation of its dictatorship and the further development of socialist construction.

To be able to correctly point out the consecutive stages of transitional periods is not merely of theoretical but, as we have already pointed out above, of immense practical value and significance in the work of directing the struggle of the proletariat of determining the strategy and tactics (see, for instance, in Vol. XX, *Letters on Tactics*, pp. 99-108).

Lenin knew how to actually follow up the struggle of contradictions, of opposites. And that is the main thing. We have already pointed out, that dialectic materialism demands a formulation of the actual process of development. Here we approach still another counter-view.

True (objective) *dialectics* are contrasted with sophistry, which means not a study of the real process of development in its entirety, but an arbitrary playing with conceptions (subjective dialectics, arbitrarily applied, torn from all connection with its base—the dalectic movement of the external material world).

Many examples of sophistry can be found in the struggle of opportunists against revolutionary Marxism, in the arguments of Kautsky and Plechanov in the period in which they betrayed revolutionary Marxism. An analysis of the sophism of the opportunists is given, for instance, in the article *The Collapse of the Second International*. Lenin says there:

> "The dialectic method demands a many-sided investigation of a given social phenomenon in its development; it demands that we proceed from the exterior, from the apparent, to the fundamental moving forces, to the development of the productive forces and to the class struggle." (Lenin, Works, Vol. XVIII, pp. 247-248.)

The sophist, however, takes up a certain thesis which, under certain conditions appears to be entirely correct, and substitutes it for a real comprehensive study, passing over in silence the most important thing, namely the fact that the very conditions that justified the given thesis are absent today, that the entire surroundings have changed, and precisely this changes the basis of the whole thing. Marx and Engels, for instance, spoke about the validity of the national-liberation wars in Europe during the first half of the 19th century (for instance, in Prussia, 1813); Kautsky carried over those words of Marx and Engels into another epoch, applying them to the outright imperialistic and robber wars of the 20th century.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "The method of the sophist throughout all times, said Lenin, is to make use of examples which obviously relate to cases which are different in principle." (*Ibid.*, p. 128.)

The entire article *The Collapse of the Second International* is a splendid example of materialist dialectics. The article contains detailed and definite statements and explanations as to precisely what the sophisms of the opportunists consist of. In all the polemical works of Lenin there is no end to such examples of how to make use of materialist dialectics and how to struggle against incorrect views of the opportunists which pervert the truth. Criticizing the errors of his adversaries Lenin exposed the roots of these errors, pointed out exactly in what the errors consist and how to correct them. Lenin did this in the polemics with the Populists: *Who are the "Friends of the People" and How Do They Fight Against the Social Democrats?*; with Struve: *The Economic Contents of Populism and Its Criticism in the Book of Mr. Struve;* with the Economists: *What Is To Be Done?;* and in the polemics with the Mensheviks, the liquidators, the "recallists" and with Trotsky: *Two Tactics; Notes by a Journalist; Debatable Questions; On the Violation of Unity Covered up with Cries of Unity,* etc.; and in the philosophical polemics with the Machians: *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* etc. This is the only correct method, a really dialectic method of conquest not a simple shoving aside (which is easily done) but a detailed analysis, a conscientious effort to illumine the question in all its details based on a deep study and understanding of the entire subject, discussion as a whole, (while not losing a general grasp of the whole because of attention to details). In the final results we get a deep all-sided understanding, all things are shown in their true interrelationship as we find them in actual life, we arrive at the concrete truth to a full, all-sided, exhaustive illumination of the subject, to an understanding of it as a unity of opposites.

You cannot understand capitalism without understanding the unity of opposites of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and of the inevitable transition of capitalism into Communism through the class struggle of the proletariat. You cannot understand the law of motion and of the development of the universe without studying and trying to understand the unity of the opposites of ether and matter, positive and negative electricity, repulsion and attraction (see Lenin, Works, *On the Question of Dialectics,* Vol. XIII, p. 301). The struggle of opposites, eternal change of forms, transition from one condition into another, from one form to another—such are the dialectics of the whole world surrounding us.

In characterizing dialectics we have dwelt all the time on their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basic law: the law of the unity of opposites. We have done this because precisely this particular law is the most important, and, yet, it has been explained and discussed least of all in the popular literature. This law, the same as the other laws—the law of "transition of quality into quantity," and the law of the "negation or negation," were splendidly explained by Engels in his *Anti-Duehring*. *

OPPORTUNISM—SOCIAL DEMAGOGY ARE THE GREATEST ENEMIES OF THE REVOLUTION

1. In a period of the approaching of decisive revolutionary situations, the compromise parties are the most dangerous enemies of the working class and the strongest supporters of the enemies of revolution.

2. Without the isolation of such parties, it is impossible to overthrow the enemy (Czarism and the bourgeoisie.)

3. It therefore follows that in the period of preparation of revolution the greatest fire must be directed against the compromise parties, for their isolation, in order to detach the toiling masses from their influence.—(STALIN: *On the Road to October*.)

* See *Anti-Duehring*, part I, chapter 12, "Dialectics. Quantity and Quality."; Chapter 13: Dialectics. Negation of the Negation." A splendid explanation of the dialectic method was given by Engels in his pamphlet, *Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science*," made up of three chapters taken from the same *Anti-Duehring*. The Chapter 2 of the pamphlet is devoted to a discussion about the essentials of the dialectic method.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For a Bolshevist Study of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

SPEECH DELIVERED BY COMRADE *I. M. KAGANOVITCH* ON DECEMBER 1, 1931, ON THE OCCASION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE INSTITUTE OF RED PROFESSORS

I. IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING MARXIST CADRES IN OUR PARTY

COMRADES, today, the tenth anniversary of the Institute of Red Professors, the warmest greetings of the Party and of the Central Committee are due to you as staunch champions of the general line of the Party. (Loud applause.)

The Institute of Red Professors is becoming the leading body of the rapidly growing new theoretical cadres of the Party. The problem of cadres has always occupied the most important place in the work of our Party. It has been dealt with in different ways in the various stages of the revolution. Nevertheless, it has always been regarded as one if the most important problems in the fight of the Party for the abolition of classes, for Communism.

The reason for this is that our Party has been always hostile to the theory of spontaneity, to the theory of automatism in the labor movement; it has always fought to increase the role of the advance guard in the revolutionary movement and for a systematic Marxist-Leninist training of the cadres in this advance guard. Beginning with Lenin's *What Is to Be Done?*, right up to the latest period, in which our Party—as the only Party in the world—stands at the head of the big proletarian socialist state, it has always organized leading workers' cadres and always promoted ever fresh hundreds and thousands of leaders from the ranks of the working class.

Two figures taken from the history of the development of the I. R. P. (Institute of Red Professors) furnish a striking illustration of this fact. In the year 1921, at the time of its founding, there were only six workers in the Institute, constituting 6 per cent of the students.

And now? At the present time we have there 1,022 workers, *i.e.*, 60 per cent of the students in the Institute of Red Professors. (Prolonged Applause.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Party, in the course of its whole history, following the theories of Marx, Engels and Lenin, has been able, like no other Party, to connect dialectically the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement, to link them up concretely into one. Comrade Stalin, in his book on *Problems of Leninism*, has clearly characterized the importance of Marxist-Leninist theory.

> "Theory," says Stalin, "is the experience of the movements of all countries, taken in general. Theory naturally becomes empty if it is not linked up with revolutionary practice, just as practice is blind, if the way is not lit up for it by revolutionary theory. Theory can become the greatest force of the labor movement when it is indissolubly linked up with revolutionary practice. For theory, and only theory, can give the movement confidence, power of orientation and understanding for the inner connection of events; theory, and only theory, aids practice not only to understand how and whither they are bound to move in the immediate future." (Stalin: *Problems of Leninism.*)

The theoretical training of our cadres always had an actual political content. Take for instance, the old Bolshevist school founded by Lenin in Longjumeau, and compare the experience of this school with the school founded on the Isle of Capri by the Otsovist Bogdanov. Two schools—two programs, two different methods of training cadres. Whilst with Bogdanov, in the Isle of Capri, the history of world conceptions, the history of art, the history of Russian literature, the Church and State of Russia occupied a particularly prominent place, in Lenin's school the program consisted of the following: agrarian question, theory and practice of Socialism, labor legislation.

In comparing these programs we clearly see that the Bolsheviki, in this case, Lenin, understood how to put and deal with the fundamental questions of the revolution, inseparably connecting theory and practice. It is therefore certainly not due to chance that from Lenin's school there emerged some members of the C. C. and of the C. C. C.

The I. R. P. is and must be the continuation of the further development of the work of our Party to train cadres, fighters for the Marxist-Leninist Bolshevik theory. This, of course, does not mean that any guarantee can be given that all students at the I. R. P. will become members of the C. C. and the C. C. C. (Laughter.)

The I. R. P. first arose as a school for the training of teachers. But the character of the training of cadres changes according to the measure of the growth of the tasks of our Party and of socialist construction. Think of the period of 1921. It was the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time of the introduction of the N. E. P., the period of the revival of the old bourgeois professors at the universities. A considerable part of these bourgeois professors at the universities were very hostile at that time and worked both theoretically and practically against us. The politically most active part of them prepared the ideology and practice of sabotage.

The syllabus became more extensive, the general development of culture demanded above all the creation of our own Bolshevist cadres of instructors, for a cadre of 10 to 20 Bolshevist instructors no longer sufficed our Party. The Party, it must be remembered, has the power and is guiding a tremendous proletarian State.

In the subsequent period, with the increasing extent and pace of socialist construction, when the tasks on all fronts of socialist construction became more complicated, the Institute of Red Professors also commenced to train cadres for socialist economy and for the State apparatus. The need for such cadres was very clearly revealed in the period of sabotage, in the period of the accentuated class struggle, when wreckers had positions in the State apparatus and the Right deviators did not wish to fight against them and, by reason of their whole attitude, could not fight against them. Already at the time of the Shachty trial comrade Stalin sharply raised the question of training of new cadres.

Today we are able to record undoubted successes in this sphere. Hundreds of thousands and millions are being trained in the high schools and technical institutions. We already have some institutions in which a great number of experts are Communists. Let us take, for instance, the People's Commissariat for Agriculture. Here nearly half the experts are Communists; out of 260 experts 126 are Communists. We must not, however, be intoxicated by our successes. We must persistently and perseveringly realize the tasks contained in the six conditions laid down by comrade Stalin. Simultaneously with a rational utilization of the best of the old experts, we must work systematically, day in and day out, at filling the ranks of the old cadres with new proletarian experts.

The Institute of Red Professors must see to the training of workers who build up and administer the proletarian State, and also provide teaching staffs.

The importance of the teaching staff is tremendous. We must fight in a Bolshevist manner to improve the quality of our educational system. And here the role of the teacher is particularly great. In his letter to the members of the school on the Isle of Capri, Lenin particularly emphasized the importance of the teachers.

He wrote as follows:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "In every school the most important thing is the ideological, political tendency of the lectures. What determines this tendency? It is determined wholly and entirely by the staff of teachers. You must realize quite clearly comrades, that any 'supervision,' any 'guidance,' all 'programs,' 'statutes,' etc. so far as the staff of teachers are concerned, are empty sound. No supervision, no program is able to alter the tendency of the work as determined by the composition of the teaching staff. And no self-respecting organization, fraction or group would ever take on the responsibility for a school the tendency of which is already determined beforehand by the teachers, particularly when this tendency is a hostile one."

When Lenin wrote this he was opposing the composition of the teaching staff on the Isle of Capri, but the importance of this letter today is not less but greater.

Many think it suffices to write a book, to draft a program, or, as they like to express it nowadays, to draw up "a draft of methods" in order to lay down the tendency of the instruction. That is a big msitake. For this reason, comrades, we lay special emphasis on the necessity of further developing the wŏrk for the Marxist training of teachers, for increased fight for the quality of the teaching.

II. THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE TRAINING OF CADRES

1. *The Fight for Instruction in Accordance with the Party Line*

Instruction must at all costs be connected with practical work. We must extend and improve practical production all around; we must link up the training of cadres, especially in the I. R. P., with the work of the State, Soviet and Party apparatus, with the economic organs, with practical work in the People's Commissariats.

And this must be done in all Institutes of Red Professors, in all departments (Transport, Planning, Agrarian departments, etc.). We must not think that a good agricultural expert can be trained in the I. R. P. if this expert is not most closely connected with the building up of Soviet and collective farms, if he cannot apply his knowledge, his constructive ability, in order to analyze and generalize the exceedingly rich experiences in the field of practice, to understand in a profound and Leninist manner the dialectics of reality.

Nowhere else in the world is there such scope for experiment, such a laboratory in which the learner can test his knowledge in practice, as in our country.

Every student in the Institute of Red Professors, every learner must be able to generalize practice, to be able to raise practice to the level of theory and to enrich theory by practice. Here is an example.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In dealing last year with the difficulties in our transport system, we encountered the factor of *obeslitska,* the lack of personal responsibility; we ascertained that the chief evil in regard to this lack of personal responsibility was in the driving of locomotives. Appropriate measures were adopted. There commenced the struggle to insure that each locomotive should be served by the same pair (driver and fireman), and things improved.

One would have thought, if the Party fought for the solution of the transport problem, then our scientific cadres, the Communist Academy and the I. R. P., would have followed the path already smoothed and try to find how to help the Party in restoring the transport system. After six months, the Party encountered the second evil, the lack of personal responsibility in handling the railway carriages and wagons. If, however, our scientific workers, our scientific cadres, and especially the transport section of the I. R. P. had studied the experiences in the struggle to improve the serving of the locomotives and applied these experiences to transport, they would have encountered in good time the evil of the lack of personal responsibility in handling the wagons.

The student in the Institute of Red Professors must specialize in his sphere, nevertheless every student in the I. R. P. is a Party member, a Marxist-Leninist, and therefore we cannot proceed in the following manner: here is one who is trained as an economist —he must deal with nothing else but economy; and here is one who is studying philosophy—his sphere is only philosophy, etc. We must fight against such a "specialization."

In reality there are only inseparable integral parts of a uniform Marxist-Leninist education. Of course, there is a specialization; and this is also necessary: In every institution it is necessary to ascertain the foundation from which one must proceed, the chief thing with which one engages in. One must not, however, carry specialization to absurdity. One must not forget that in life, all these specializations are mutually related, that they are all indissolubly linked up with one another.

The Party demands a concrete treatment, a striving for a clear aim in theoretical work. In its fight against the divergence of theory and practice, in its fight on two fronts—on the one side against useless busy-ness and narrow practicality, and on the other side against scholasticism and formalism, the Party demands of the theoretical cadres a profound study of Marxist and Leninist theory and tactics and the closest connection of theory with practice.

The students in the I. R. P. must, in preparing for their professions as leaders and educators, at the same time educate themselves. As leader and educator of others one is not free from committing mistakes onself. Therefore, these students must systematically en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gage in self-criticism. One must say, on our Communist scientific front the last few years have been years of profound self-criticism in our ranks.

On the scientific front, a number of harmful "systems," a number of glaring errors of principle were discovered—Rubinism in political economy, Menshevist idealism and mechanism in philosophy, a number of errors in the sphere of law and of the State, and finally, various harmful "theories" in the field of literature. Bourgeois and petty bourgeois influence was everywhere discovered on these theoretical fronts.

One can say that Gromanism* in the State Planning Institution and Rubinism in economic science are connected with each other. The one attempted to create confusion in the setting up of the Plan, and the other attempted to divert the attention of our economists from actual practice of socialist construction, to confuse them by abstract discussions of apparently Marxist, but in fact anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist formulas.

The separation of economics from politics is the most characteristic feature of bourgeois theoreticians and their social fascist lackeys.

Thus, for instance, Karl Kautsky, who has long been exposed as an enemy of Marxism, writes in his latest book, *Materialist Conception of History*, as follows:

> "How is it possible that two antagonistic classes have become not only absolutely but relatively stronger. The explanation of the apparent contradiction is, that these two classes have become constantly stronger in two quite different spheres. The forces of the capitalists are constantly increasing in the sphere of economy, and the forces of the proletariat are continually increasing in the sphere of politics."

Trotsky in no way lagged behind Kautsky in propagating this bourgeois theory. In his book, *Permanent Revolution*, he writes that:

> "A country can become ripe for the dictatorship of the proletariat without having become ripe not only for the independent building up of Socialism but also for broad measures of socialization."

In other words, in politics—the proletariat, and in economics—the bourgeoisie.

Thus on the basis of the fight against the Marxist-Leninist unity of economics and politics, there has emerged a complete identity of the views of Kautsky and Trotsky.

In the history of the fight of our Party against the various distor-

---

* Gromann was a sabotager in the State Planning Commission and was one of the accused in the Ramsin trial.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions and deviations we come across similar attempts to separate politics from economics.

Let us take economism. Wherein lies the nature of its mistakes? It lies in making concessions to the spontaneity of the economic development, in ignoring the political superstructure and its reaction on economics. This is an old story. Let us take however, the Right deviation; the essence of its mistake is—denial of the revolutionary transformatory role of the proletarian dictatorship, the insistence on spontaneity. Both in the case of the economists and the Rights there is, at bottom, a separation of politics from economics, a setting, up of one against the other.

Further, if you consider the discussions on the trade unions you will see that the essence of the mistakes of the opponents of Lenin consists in the lack of understanding of the dialectial unity of economics and politics, or, as comrade Lenin said, in "forgetting Marxism, which is expressed in a theoretically false, eclectic definition of the relations of politics to economics."

For this reason we must in the Institute of Red Professors and on all economic fronts permeate education more with our Party tendencies; we must learn how to find in every theoretical thesis its application to the burning questions of the day, to understand the synthesis of antagonisms in reality.

To know how to find the synthesis of antagonisms in reality means not be afraid of difficulties, above all not to be afraid of the contradictions of life which rise up in our path, but to overcome them with Bolshevist energy and persistence. And this means also that our difficulties are such that they contain within them the possibility of overcoming them. This means that the characteristic of our difficulties is that they themselves give us the basis for overcoming them. Stalin: *Political Report to the C.C. at the XVI Congress of the C.P.S.U.*)

We must convert this possibility into reality; in mobilizing all spiritual forces and the will to victory we must help this objective possibility, convert it more rapidly and better into reality. One must approach education in a Bolshevist manner and understand how to take from Hegel, for instance, what is necessary for us, for our fight. In particular, we must approach the history of the past in a Bolshevist, Leninist manner by connecting the history of the past with the general line of the Party, with those new great tasks which confront us today and which will confront us tomorrow.

Therein consists the nature of the Party tendency in education, therein lies the meaning of Marxist-Leninist education, and it is necessary to fight in a Bolshevist manner for this.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III. MARXIST-LENINIST EDUCATION AND THE HISTORY OF THE PARTY.

1. *Trotzkyist Contraband in the History of the Party.*

We are now faced with new tasks, comrade Stalin has laid bare the most harmful excrescences and the biggest mistakes in one of the most important spheres—in the sphere of the history of our Bolshevist Party. Comrade Stalin, in his letter, has raised the questions of the Party history, the tasks of its study, to a very high level. The history of our Party is the history of an irreconcilable fight against deviations from the consistent, revolutionary Marxist-Leninist point of view.

Our Party has grown enormously; it has grown in the ruthless, energetic fight against deviations, against distortions of Marxism-Leninism. In the last decade this dispute turned on the main questions of the policy of the Party, on the main questions of socialist construction. The dispute over daily policy and practice was always an outspokenly theoretical dispute. It always had its starting point in theoretical differences of opinion. The practical errors likewise had their roots in distortions of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The fight for Marxist-Leninist education is of extraordinary importance, and is exceedingly urgent precisely at the present time, because we have in our Party over two and a half million members, including between one and a half to two million who have been in the Party three, four or five years; then we have five and a half million members of the Young Communist League. As you see, it is a question of millions. But it is a question of quality as well quantity, for here we have members of the most revolutionary, theoretically consistent and disciplined Party in the history of the world.

How are these millions of the young generation to be educated? How are they to be converted into staunch and experienced Leninists?

We put the whole problem of the Marxist-Leninist education of the Party members. How is this problem to be tackled in a Bolshevist manner? This must not be tackled from a pedantic point of view—not formally and stereotyped, but from a revolutionary, Bolshevist point of view. The history of our Party is often approached quite formally; the chronology of events is treated more or less accurately, some facts are given prominence, different events are more or less correctly described, but the connection between these facts and events is not revealed. A dialectical study of the history of our Party is necessary, as well as an understanding of the laws of development and further, a keen interest

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the main and fundamental questions in the decisive stages of our revolution.

We must educate the Party members and the members of the Young Communist League, elevate ever fresh strata of the working class and instruct them in the history of the Bolshevist Party. This history, however, is not, as many schematic historians believe, the history of a past which is sinking into oblivion. Our whole history is a programme, strategy and tactics, the organizing of the heroic fight of the best leading elements of our class for the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the abolition of classes, for Communism.

And if our country, which formerly ranked as the most backward country in the world, is today a country of Socialism, it is thanks to the Bolshevist programme, to the tactics and organization of the proletariat, to the programme and the leadership of our Party; it is thanks to that persistent fight which the best people, with Lenin at their head, waged for years against the Narodniki, the legal Marxists, the economists, Mensheviki, Trotzkyists and the Right and irreconcilable elements in the Party. For this reason there is no better means of educating our youth in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism than the history of our Party.

This is the reason why comrade Stalin reacted so sharply to the exceedingly harmful distortions and big mistakes which had been committed in presenting the history of our Party.

In his letter to the editors of the *Proletarskaya Revoluzia* he exposed the Trotzkyist slanderous attempt to distort the history of our Party, to calumniate Lenin and to make out to the members of the Party and the Komsomols that Lenin was not a Bolshevik until the revolution.

What is criminal on the part of the sorry historians of the type of Slutzky is the endeavor to represent matters as if up to the revolution Lenin had underestimated centrism in the Second International and not really combated it; that he had supported the so-called Left social democrats in the German social democratic party, i. e., Rosa Luxemburg and others, only feebly and in some cases not at all.

One of them, Mironov, who has passed through the Institute of Red Professors and also formerly held the position of deputy director of the Academy for Communist Education (a big academy with more than 2,000 Communists), wrote that the Bolsheviks did not oppose Kautsky until the war, because they considered him to be an orthodox Marxist.

Is there any need to refute these malicious distortions and falsifications of the history of Leninism?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One has only to think of the history of Lenin's fight against Martov, Axelrod, Plechanov from the year 1903 onwards, and finally against Trotzky in order to understand that Lenin fought like no other against every kind of opportunism, including centrism, by exposing it above all in the ranks of his own party, the Russian social democratic party, and thereby at the same time exposing centrism, Kautskyism in the Second International. Lenin constantly combated and stigmatized the opportunists who are so "revolutionary" where other countries are concerned but put up no fight against the enemy in their own country; he combated the revisionists and conciliators in his immediate neighborhood, and thereby at the same time exposed revisionism, conciliation on the whole front of the international revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

And this is precisely why Lenin did not unreservedly support the so-called Lefts in the German social democracy. What were the Left social democrats, Rosa Luxemburg, Parvus and the others? Did they stand just as much to the Left as Lenin, as the Russian Bolsheviki? Were they as consistent as Lenin, as the Russian Bolsheviki? Can one describe them as Bolsheviki? The most elementary acquaintance with the facts of history shows beyond doubt that Lenin, and the Russian Bolsheviki in general, were the *only* thoroughgoing consistent Marxist Lefts in the whole in the II International in the pre-war period; that the Left social democrats in Germany were not Bolsheviki, that they vacillated the whole time between Bolshevism and Menshevism and came near the Mensheviki and centrists.

Lenin and the Bolsheviki did not always support the Lefts in the German social democracy, including Rosa Luxemburg. Why? Because Rosa Luxemburg, as Lenin has pointed out and now also Stalin points out, on a number of fundamental questions on the organizational, national and colonial sphere, on the question of imperialism, on the peasant question and on the question of the so-called permanent revolution, disagreed with the Bolsheviki and approached the centrists. She stood nearer to the Trotzkyists and Trotzky, who at that time was a real centrist and founded the centrist August bloc in the year 1911-12.

Trotzky was a centrist, and what has become of him? His centrism has become counter-revolutionism. Trotzky, the former centrist, is today, just the same as Kautzky, the former centrist, one of the most prominent champions of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The centrist Trotzky shared the fate of centrist Kautsky.

Rosa Luxemburg, of course, has many great merits. Her name has gone down in history as a fighter for the emancipation of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working class, as a fighter who fell at the hands of the German social democracy. No one will dispute that. Does that mean, however, that we must falsify history by passing over and maintaining silence regarding the errors of Rosa Luxemburg and the Left social democrats of Germany in face of the demands for historical truth. It is obvious that it does not mean that. Comrade Radek spoke in the fraction of the Marxist historical researchers. He confessed to a number of mistakes; he admitted that Rosa Luxemburg had not always adopted a correct Bolshevist standpoint. He did not, however, connect the false standpoint he adopted when he collaborated with Rosa Luxemburg, with the false standpoint he adopted later when he collaborated with Trotzky. He elaborated the theory that Rosa Luxemburg formed a bridge over which the best social democratic workers could come to us, and therefore she must be criticized more mildly. In the first place this theory is false: it is not absolutely necessary that the workers come to us over the Luxemburgian bridge. Secondly: those workers who are still connected with this bridge, must be informed of the mistakes of the Left social democrats in order to learn from these mistakes and to become real Bolsheviki. Otherwise this bridge, if we cloak over the mistakes of Rosa Luxemburg, will become a bridge to the social democracy and not to Communism. If, however, we expose Rosa Luxemburg's mistakes, in a Bolshevist manner, then this bridge will be for the workers a bridge from the social democratic mistakes to the Bolsheviki! This is the way in which the Bolsheviki must approach this question. Comrade Radek, however, has not gone the whole way. This is apparently due to the fact, which he has not completely revealed, and he himself was either a bridge between Rosa Luxemburg and Trotzky, or has gone over the bridge from Rosa Luxemburg to Trotzky, i. e. the general non-Bolshevist way. (Laughter.)

Wherein lies the importance of Slutzky's article? It lies in the fact that it is an open attempt to smuggle the Trotzkyist plunder through under the flag of the Left social democrats of the pre-war period, under the flag of Luxemburgism. In this sense Slutzky's article is a characteristic phenomenon of the present situation. Slutzky was for a long time a Menshevik; then he was outside of the Party, and it was not until 1930 that he became a candidate for membership of our Party. It is a fact that this man, who had only recently become a Party candidate, was given the possibility of publishing an article against Lenin, in which he accused Lenin of having underestimated the danger of centrism, of having right to the last not supported the Left German social democrats who were near to Trotzky, and that therefore he was not a genuine revolutionary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be doing Slutzky too much honor if we were to engage here in a serious criticism of this libellous nonsense. It suffices that comrade Stalin, in passing, has torn this nonsense to shreds. The point here is not that Slutzky has written libellous nonsense. What is more serious is that a Bolshevist paper has given space in its columns to this nonsense. It is a question of rotten liberalism on the part of some of our Communists towards the Trotzkyist minded writers. When Trotzky, in his contemptible and boastful book *My Life* describes himself as the center of revolution and does not mention that he has long gone over to the camp of the enemy, there is nothing remarkable in this, for what is there left for a bankrupt and renegade to do than to comfort himself with boasting and self-glorification?

When Slutzky attempts in his article to make use of the Luxemburgian flag in order to smuggle his Trotzkyist plunder into our press, there is nothing remarkable in this, for what is there left for a bankrupt Trotzkyist than to comfort himself with such contraband.

When, however, the Bolshevik paper *Proletarskaya Revoluzia* considers it possible to place its columns at the disposal of Trotzkyist smugglers, then this is no longer a trifle. It means that there exists in our ranks a rotten liberalism towards deviations from Bolshevism and towards distortions of the history of our Party. It means that there exists in our ranks a rotten liberalism towards deviations from Bolshevism and towards distortions of the history of our Party. It means that there are still people in our ranks who in their stupidity are ready, for the sake of rotten liberalism, to render voluntary aid in the falsification of the history of Bolshevism.

For these reasons, comrades, I believe that the fight against the rotten liberalism in our ranks must be constituent part of our fight against the falsification and distortion of the history of our Party.

2. *The Leninist Growth of the Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution into the Socialist Revolution and the Errors of the Historians*

Unfortunately, the *Proletarskaya Revoluzia* is not our only weak spot. Comrade Yaroslavsky's *History of the C. P. S. U.* has proved a still weaker spot. Comrade Yaroslavsky, the editor of four volumes of the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, has permitted glaring mistakes: he has given the young historians chosen by him a free hand, and not only not hindered them in their attempts to distort the history of the Party, but also put his seal, his signature, his name thereunder and thereby supported them.

I will not analyze here all the mistakes of the "History" which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was edited by comrade Yaroslavsky. These mistakes have already been criticized in part and will undoubtedly be subjected to further criticism. I only wish to say here that comrade Yaroslavsky, in his "History," or better said in the "History" edited by him, treats falsely the question of the revolution of 1905 and likewise falsely presents the role of Lenin and his estimate of the character of the Russian revolution; the presentation of our Bolshevist treatment of the question of the hegemony of the proletariat and especially of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution is also false.

As an illustration we will quote only an extract from page 206 of the third volume of the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, where comrade Bayevsky writes:

> "And this objective connection between the revolution against Tsarism and the revolution against imperialism was *recognized* by the Party already (!) in the war years. . . ."

As you see, he writes as if he does Lenin and the Party a favor by admitting that they recognized this connection "already" (!) in the war years. According to the opinion of this profound "historian," this connection was expressed by Lenin in the new treatment of the question of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia into the socialist revolution, *in conection with the war. It was also expressed in the preparation for the change in the strategic plans.*"

In what way, one might ask, does this differ from Trotzky's notorious "change of strategy." At bottom there is no difference between them.

In the second part of the "History" one finds a number of errors and a thoroughly confused estimate of the stand-point of the Bolsheviki in 1905 in the spirit of a Trotzkyist treatment of the Leninist standpoint regarding the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution.

The mistakes in the "History" edited by comrade Yaroslavsky, the mistakes in the estimation of the role of the Bolsheviki in the year 1905, the denial that Lenin was for the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution inevitably led to a false and harmful estimate of the role of the Bolsheviki in the first period of the year 1917, to a base slandering of the Bolsheviki. When now some historian muddleheads of the type of D. Kin, formalists of "history," wish to represent matters thus: Comrades, I am for the Party, for the C. C., I have only written a small page, judge for yourselves, what crime have I committed—when these people endeavor to reduce this whole matter to a small page, then, of course, they only show their ignorance in regard to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory and history. Look, a small page,—is that what it is all about? One does not need to know a great deal about history in order to see a connection between the mistakes in the "History" edited by comrade Yaroslavsky in judging the role of the Bolsheviki in 1905 and the slanderous Trotzkyist estimate of the role of the Bolsheviki in February-March, 1917.

The history of our Party, and the standpoint of Lenin suffer a similar distortion at the hands of comrade Popov (K. A.). He, too, it appears, does not treat the standpoint of Lenin in the question of the growth of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution in a Bolshevist spirit. In order to confirm the correctness of his presentation, in editing the collection of the selected works of Lenin he has left out one of the most important articles by Lenin on the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. I give here a quotation from this article by Lenin:

> "We first support the peasants in general with all means up to expropriation against the landowners and then (and not even then but at the same time) we support the proletariat against the peasants in general. To calculate the combination of forces within the peasantry at the present time, 'on the day after the (democratic) revolution'—that is an empty utopia. Without becoming adventurers, without being false to our scientific conscience, without hunting after cheap popularity, we can say and say only one thing: We shall help the whole of the peasantry with all our forces to convert the revolution into a democratic revolution in order that it shall be easier for us, the Party of the proletariat, to proceed as quickly as possible to the new and higher task of the socialist revolution. We do not promise any harmony, any equality, any 'socialization' as a result of the victory of a peasant insurrection at the present time, on the contrary, we 'promise' fresh struggle, new unequality, new revolution for which we shall also strive." (Volume VIII, Page 186-187, Russian edition.)

And now, just imagine, it is precisely the passage regarding the attitude of our Party to the peasant movement which comrade K. A. Popov leaves out of the selected works of Lenin.

Why? For what reason? What is his own attitude to the problem of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution? According to Popov, up to the year 1917 Lenin had a special plan, namely: The Bolsheviki assumed that between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution a socialist revolution is bound to take place in the West. It follows therefore that Popov, at bottom, replaced the Leninist theory of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution with the Trotzkyist theory, and therefore Lenin's article does not suit him and he leaves it out. This is how our Party history is written!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whilst permitting mistakes of a Trotzkyist character, some of these "historians" seek to justify themselves by feeble talk about "objectivity" and "political expediency," which, however, only increases the anti-Party character of their mistakes. At a meeting of the Society of Marxist Historians, one of the authors of the "History" edited by comrade Yaroslavsky, comrade Mintz, declared regarding the mistakes permitted in Volume IV that, "in emphasizing this or that fact we have proceeded not from the standpoint of political expediency but from the standpoint of that objectivity which is by no means characteristic of our political history, but constitutes only a relapse into bourgeois liberalism."

Comrade Mintz, while pretending to criticize bourgeois historians and his former errors, in reality, by this putting of the question—by opposing "objectivity" to "political expediency"—resurrects his old opportunist mistakes. Here it is not a question of these methodological errors, but that comrade Mintz attempts by his declaration so to represent the whole matter as if he had written a good objective history, but ought to have renounced "objectivity" for the sake of "political expediency." Comrade Mintz obviously forgets that history, including the history of the C.P.S.U., must be scientifically objective, absolutely in accordance with the truth; that without such qualities history loses its scientific character and becomes mythology.

It is scarcely necessary to discuss the theoretical untenability of this new standpoint of comrade Mintz. Comrade Mintz's statements are a maneuver, a miserable attempt to gloss over the main content of the mistakes which have been allowed to appear in the "History" edited by comrade Yaroslavsky. Precisely this shows that Mintz's "History" is not an objective history. Just as the bourgeois social-opportunist historians of the Second International take cover behind the "objectivity" of their "scientific" works whilst in reality they help the fight of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, so also comrade Mintz and his friends, by their alleged "objective history" but in reality by their outspokenly subjective "history," help the avowed calumniators and falsifiers of the history of the Party, the Trotzkyists. In spite of, or rather because the "objective historians," in their preface to the Volume IV, proudly speak of the endeavors they made "to give a completely objective portrayal," "to treat the question with the greatest possible historical objectivity, and keeping before them the historical perspective during the whole work," the collective historians, under the leadership of comrade Yaroslavsky, have not given us an objective history, but a history falsified in many respects and savouring of Trotzkyism.

It is quite in vain therefore that comrade Mintz maligns his own "History" by making out that there has been no "political

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expediency." There was a political expediency, but a Trotzkyist and no other.

Errors in the histories, both in those edited by comrade Yaroslavsky and in those of other historians, are the result of non-dialectic, scholastic and formalistic treatment of the study of history in general and the history of our Party in particular. Therefore comrade Stalin, in his letter, specially emphasized the task of fighting against the formal-bureaucratic approach to history. When some Bolsheviki, champions of the general line of the Party, are caught by the bait of the Trotzkyists, this is to a great extent because they forget dialectics, and separate and oppose to one another theory and practice, history and politics.

The formal study of events, of the historical facts, formal analogies, often lead to a number of mistakes in the conception of many things in tactics and in the fight of our Party. Thus, for example, one might accuse the Bolsheviki, who in the year 1917 issued the slogan, "Away with the ten capitalist Ministers!", when Mensheviki and social-revolutionaries sat in the government, of being inconsistent (what some historians actually did). Nevertheless this slogan was the only right one and was also one of the most popular among the workers at that time. The slogan appears inconsistent to those who approach the question formally, scholastically. If, however, one considers the situation at that time, then one understands the ingeniousness of the tactics of the Bolsheviki at the moment when it was necessary to wrest the Soviets from the cadet party.

There was a time in the year 1917 when the Mensheviki and the social revolutionaries were predominant in the Soviets. We set up the demand that these Soviets should seize power. Why did we put the question thus? Because in the first months of the revolution the masses were swept off their feet and, as Lenin said, "constitutional illusions were very prevalent among them." The Tsar was overthrown. Everybody was wearing red ribbons. Many could not understand at once what had happened; many did not immediately adopt the path of clear fight for the development of the revolution; did not at once perceive the character of the Mensheviki and the social revolutionaries. The Bolsheviki, therefore, were for the transferance of power to the menshevist-social-revolutionary Soviets in order to cause these gentlemen to proceed to carry out their programme, in order thereby to give the masses the possibility of seeing them in their true color. The formalists do not understand this, the Leninists, however, will understand this.

Or take another case. We accused the Kerensky government of putting off the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, as if we Bolsheviki stood for the Constituent Assembly, whilst shortly after-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards we dispersed it. If one approaches the matter formally, scholastically, bureaucratically, there appears here to be an "inconsistency." But the dialectical Leninists could not pursue any other tactics, for the revolution demanded that the masses should be led up to the walls of the Constituent Assembly in order that they might see with their own eyes its utter uselessness.

Those who do not understand Lenin, who was filled with the will to victory, those who do not grasp the elasticity of Leninist tactics, cannot understand the history of our Party, cannot study it and draw from it the Leninist conclusions. In the fight for the victory of the proletarian dictatorship, Lenin changed the slogans because he took into account the feelings of the masses, their readiness to fight, their overcoming of prejudices; he captured the masses without deviating one step from the chief thing, from the fight for the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We need such an approach to the study of the history of the Party for the education of our youth in its experiences, and not the rotten formal-bureaucratic method of rummaging among papers as "historians" of the type of Slutsky do. Because these people did not come across a paper on which Lenin had written that "Kautsky is a scoundrel," so Slutsky, who once idealized Kautsky, and perhaps idolizes him still, has the brazenness to reproach Lenin with not having fought against the centrists. In the search for such a paper they are ready to write a whole pile of articles, but will not take the trouble to notice that fact which is *known to everybody*: that Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviki were the only Left group in the world which ruthlessly drove all the centrists out of the Party.

Here we have before us a typical Trotskyist-Menshevist method in the "study," "interpretation" and "presentation" of history.

3. *Exposure of the Maneuvers of the Trotskyists, Bolshevist Struggle for Leninism, for the General Line of the Party*

The particular feature of the present stage of the fight for the Party, for Leninism, consists in the fact that Trotskyism has been defeated, the Right deviation exposed and the general line of the Party has remained victorious along the whole line. Our victories —these are one turbine after another, one work after another, the growth of the production of industry and agriculture, the Bolshevist tempo of our development.

It is now difficult for one to come forward openly under the flag of Trotskyism. One must now come forward under other flags, slogans, theses, formulations. One must now cast doubt on the consistency of the Leninist Bolshevist theory in order to besmirch the actual realization of the general line of the Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opportunism attempts therefore at present to creep into our ranks under various guises; it attempts to fawn and to ingratiate itself, to grovel, to slip through the wicket gate of the history of our Party.

What is the meaning of the "philosophy of History" of Slutsky, of Alter and other smugglers? There is no doubt that here we have to do with a direct or indirect attempt on the part of the Trotskyists and semi-Trotskyists to exert their influence on the study of the history of our Party, with the attempt to exert their influence on the education of our Party youth and *Komsomolz*. Herein lies the political meaning of the cunning, in form, but in essence very crude historical investigation.

Trotsky is no longer in our country. Here with us, in the Soviet State, the ill-famed, soiled flag of Trotsky, which has been torn to shreds by the working class, can win nobody over to its side. One must approach the masses from another side, gently, with "legal" methods. One must proceed from the front of the Party history, the history of the labor movement, at the same time making use of the flag of Luxehburgism and any other mask.

These standard bearers of Trotskyism speculate as follows: Now, you Bolsheviki, you members of the C. C., are occupied with the erection of Magnitogorsk, Dnieprostroy, the new Moscow, with the construction of Kusnetzkstroi; you are busy with your plans and your tractors, with potatoes and coal, etc.—just carry on. We, however, shall engage in history, we shall proceed very circumspectly, and where cunning is of no avail we shall pretend to be stupid and take advantage of the rotten liberalism of some Bolsheviki; we shall attempt to achieve our aim, to influence the education of the youth, always having in mind the "far aim" of our bankrupt leaders.

It was for this reason that comrade Stalin laid so much emphasis on the danger of a rotten liberal attitude towards the Trotskyist falsifiers.

One must keep facts in mind. Slutsky, a Party candidate of 1930, a former Menshevik, is given the possibility of besmirching Leninism and defaming Lenin; and this in the columns of our Bolshevist paper, *Proletarskaya Revoluzia*. He is also given the hospitality of the columns of the *Marxist Historian*. Another "historian," Alter, a Trotskyist who has been expelled from the Party, is given the opportunity of speaking in the Communist Academy, and, just think, in the fraction of the Society of Marxist Historians when comrade Stalin's article is being discussed. He is replied to politely and in a liberal manner: "Comrade Alter is mistaken, he is defending the Trotskyist smuggled goods; he is somewhat in error, he distorts the facts." It suffices, however, to glance at the history

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this man in order to know that he is not a contrabandist but at bottom is himself a genuine piece of Trotskyist smuggled goods. (Laughter, applause.)

The Trotskyist who has been expelled from the Party, and is given the opportunity of speaking in the Communist fraction, comes forward and defends Luxehburgism and declares: "Luxemburgism has become merged with Bolshevism." Previously, in 1927, he wrote that "Luxemburgism, in the year 1918, became transformed into Bolshevism." Alter seizes upon the flag of Luxemburgism. He, the Trotskyist, needs it now in order to mask himself behind it.

The fact of the matter is, comrades, that the Trotskyists, the genuine and the masked Trotskyists, who are no longer able to come forward under their soiled counter-revolutionary flag, which is seized upon by the worst enemies of the proletarian dictatorship therefore seize on a new flag, the flag of Luxemburgism, in order to make use of it for their Trotskyist ends.

For what purpose? In order, under this flag, to attempt to raise again the question of the Trotskyist platform, to attempt again to revise the basis of Marxism-Leninism. They endeavor, under new conditions, in a new manner, to raise the old Trotskyist questions regarding Bolshevism, the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, fractions, etc.

We come across the fact that people who are endeavoring to break with their Trotskyist past have in reality not yet rid themselves of their former incumbrances. Comrade Radek also spoke at the fraction of the Marxist historians. One learns from his speech that the Comintern has drawn into its ranks all that is best in the labor movement, and that the Comintern must not forget all those currents and rivulets which have flowed into the Bolshevist Party. Comrade Radek must have known what this theory of "rivulets" implies! This is, in the final end, the idea of the August bloc. There also they wanted to have various rivulets in order to unite them in a stream; but nothing came of this; the rivulets, as is known, flowed in different directions. Trotskyism proved to be a rotten leaky vat. Although with us today irrigation is on a very high level and although we Moscowites intend to connect the Moscow River with the Volga, such irrigation cannot be employed in the sphere of politics. Here nothing will come of the theory of rivulets, of the mechanical connection of various rivulets.

It is true, some individual Left social democratic elements have come into the Bolshevist Party. They came, however, after Bolshevism had beaten and vanquished their prejudices and overcame their false attitude. In mentioning the Comintern Comrade Radek has forgotten the twenty-one conditions. Have the twenty-one

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions not been carried out? Were they not the weapon in the fight against those elements who wished to maintain their individual former attitude? Can one speak here of a merging and a connection? Certainly not. Comrade Radek must understand that the theory of rivulets creates a basis for the freedom of groups and fractions. If one admits a "rivulet" one must also give it the possibility to have its "current."

No, comrades, our Party is not a basin of turbid rivulets, but a powerful stream which no rivulets can check, for it has the possibility to sweep all hindrances out of its way. (Loud applause.)

Our Party, as never before, stands firmly around its Leninist C. C.; it is united in the fight for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for securing the achievements of the socialist revolution. And if today the Central Committee of our Party stands on a tremendous height, if it possesses the greatest authority among the masses of workers and collective farmers, if our leader, the head of our Party, comrade Stalin (loud applause) enjoys the undivided support and love of the Party, of the *Komsomol*, of the overwhelming majority of the working class and of the collective farmers, it is thanks to the circumstance that our C. C. of the Bolsheviki has inexorably, ruthlessly, step by step, in all spheres, exposed every attempt to distort the general line of our Party, to convert it into rivulets; every attempt to deviate from our main path, from the path of victory of Socialism in our country and in the whole world. (Loud applause.)

Comrades, we still have many difficulties in our work of construction. The fight is not yet ended. The class struggle is still going on in our country; one comes across it in various places, in town and country. There are attempts to exert bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influence not only in the working class by the kulaks and semi-kulaks who are penetrating their ranks, but also in our Party. On the tenth anniversary of the Institute of Red Professors every one of its students must say: I was a fighter for the line of the Party, I will become a still stronger and steadfast fighter, I will weld myself more closely to the Party, I will weld others along with us and will work tenaciously and persistently for the Marxist-Leninist education of the youth, for the rallying of millions around the Leninist C. C. (Lour applause.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Statement of Comrade Yaroslavsky

IN CONNECTION WITH COMRADE STALIN'S LETTER ON THE SLUTSKY ARTICLE

Translated from PRAVDA *of December* 10, 1931

THE letter of comrade Stalin to the editor of the *Proletarskaya Revoluzia,* published in No. 6 of that magazine, and also in No. 19-20 of the *Bolshevik,* took up with the true Bolshevik determination the problem of raising the science of the history of our Party to a very much higher priniciple level.

This letter sharply brought to the attention of the Party the efforts of certain Trotskyist elements n our Party to smuggle Trotskyist contraband into the text books of the history of the Party and of Leninism, and into the Bolshevik magazines and books with which the new Bolshevik cadres are being educated. It brought very timely attention to the tremendous role of the Party of the Bolsheviks in the international movement in the struggle against every type of opportunism and its particular variety—centrism. This letter again mobilizes Party thought at the new stage of the struggle for Socialism, and strengthens the Party vigilance in the struggle against liberal attitudes toward views which are foreign and hostile to the Party. Herein lies its tremendous significance at a time when millions of proletarian cadres are involved in Marxist-Leninist education, when, under new conditions, it becomes necessary to harden the Bolshevik determination of these cadres for struggle for the final victory of Socialism.

At the end of his letter comrade Stalin absolutely correctly raises the question of errors of a principle and historic character committed by myself in the capacity of *editor-in-chief* of the four published volumes of the *collective work, History of the C.P.S.U.* The widespread discussion which developed as a result of comrade Stalin's letter has shown the importance and timeliness of this point in his letter. I consider it my duty to recognize that the four volumes of the *History of the C.P.S.U.* indeed contain a series of the crudest errors fully justifying the harshest kind of criticism and requiring immediate correction.

The main error in the collective work *History of the C.P.S.U.* and the starting point of all the other most important errors of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this work is the fact that in a number of chapters of that work the Bolshevik elucidation of the events in the life and activity of the Party slip off onto the rails of a Trotskyist treatment of the subject, which has nothing in common with an objective elucidation of the history of the C.P.S.U.

From this flows the following most important errors:

1. A number of incorrect and crudely erroneous statements in Volumes II and III on the subject of the character of the revolution of 1905 as a peasant revolution and on the question of the Leninist understanding of the growing over of the bourgeois- democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. For instance, in Volume II, page 205, it is stated that the socialist revolution could not take place in 1905-1907 because "the material prerequisites for such a revolution were lacking at the time." Such a placing of the question simply brushes aside the question of growing over and thereby simply destroys the significance of all the other perfectly correct Leninist theses on the subject, taken up in Volume II and other volumes. A particularly gross error is made in the statement in Volume III (second edition, page 249), that the existence of an "objective connection between the revolution against Czarism and the revolution against imperialism was realized by the Party already during the years of the war," that this connection "found its expression in a new formulation by Lenin on the question of the growing over of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution," that "in connection with the given war it found its expression in the preparation of a change in strategic plans."

The statement in Volume IV that two revolutions took place in the village during 1917 is incorrect. To present different stages of the revolution in the village at a time when the general-peasant struggle against the landlords was approaching its final stage under the leadership of the proletariat and the revolution was going over onto socialist rails, imposes the duty upon the historian of the Party to constantly emphasize that the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution was a *bi-product* of the socialist proletarian revolution of 1917. This correct Leninist thesis which was worked out in Volume IV is distorted by the formulation concerning two revolutions.

2. This error is greatly increased by the fact that in the collective work on the *History of the C.P.S.U.* a non-objective, and strictly speaking, Trotskyist elucidation is given of the position of the Bolsheviks during the February-March period of the revolution of 1917.

Of course, these and similar errors are only clearing the way for the Trotskyist slander about a "re-arming" of the Bolshexik Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. The necessary broad criticism was not given of the left communists who represent in deeds a deviation towards Menshevism under a left cloak.

4. A number of errors were made in Volumes II and III on the question of centrism. The basic error consists in insufficient information on the role of the Party of the Bolsheviks on the international arena during the first revolution, the statement in my preface to Volume III (first edition) that "precisely during the years of imperialist war did Bolshevism appear on the world arena as a fully developed theory of the proletarian revolution." Although precisely during the period of the world war the task of the creation of the *Communist International* was openly raised by the Party of the Bolsheviks, the above mentioned formulation of the question minimizes the role of Bolshevism during the first revolution in its struggle against opportunism of all types and against centrism as a variety of opportunism.

In particular, in depicting the role of Luxemburgism, the statement made in Volume II that Rosa Luxemburg never wavered toward Menshevism on questions of tactics is incorrect. Together with the P. C. D. Rosa Luxemburg wavered toward Menshevism during the revolution of 1905-1907 on the most important questions of tactics and defended the Menshevik-Trotskyist position on the question of the permanent revolution, took up an opportunist position on the national and peasant questions, on the question of the trade unions, of armed uprising, etc.

5. The national question and the development of national organizations of the Party are very weakly illuminated in all four volumes, to which fact we have repeatedly called attention. This error is of *principle* significance as it glosses over the tremendous role of the national-colonial question in the revolutionizing of the masses and bringing them to the side of the proletarian revolution.

6. In working up the question of the *Narodniki* and taking part in the discussion on the *Narodnia Volya* aiming to carry on a struggle on two fronts on the question of the *Nadorniki*, I myself in my criticism of the errors of comrade Theodorovich failed to sharpen sufficiently the struggle against these errors.

7. I permitted inexact, and in places, incorrect formulations to slip in on the question of two lines of development, and on the motive forces of the first Russian revolution, which gave the basis for criticism of Volume II of the *History of the C.P.S.U.*

8. I consider as an unqualified error on my part the insufficiently careful selection of the staff which is preparing the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, permitting comrades Elvov and Keen to remain on the staff, notwithstanding the fact that their Trotskyist and leftist errors were known to me. The very struggle that I conducted over

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a course of many years against opposition and anti-Party groups and tendencies within the Party imposed upon me the duty of most relentless struggle against all indications of rotten liberalism that have expressed themselves in the leaving of those comrades on the staff of collaborators on the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, and also in the fact that in my capacity as editor of the magazine, *Historian-Marxist*, I expressed agreement to the publication of the new Slutsky article in order to give simultaneously a Bolshevik criticism of anti-Party views.

These errors are to be attributed mainly to my carelessness in editing of the collective work *History of the C.P.S.U.*, which carelessness was due partly to the fact of my being overloaded with work, and in trusting too much individual members of the staff, who, as the check-up has established, were not permeated with Bolshevik firmness.

I have been told of a statement made by comrade Mintz at a fraction meeting of the Plenum of the Society of Historian-Marxists, to the effect that the mistake of the collaborators in the collective work *History of the C.P.S.U.*, "lies in their excessive objectivity and their overlooking the fact that a Bolshevik history of the Party requires not so much objectivity as political advisability."

If this information is true to fact, then I must sharply repudiate such a statement as entirely incorrect and non-Bolshevik. The Party never demanded, and cannot demand of the historian, non-objectivity or the sacrificing an objective truth about the history of our Party for "political advisability." The error of the collective work *History of the C.P.S.U.* consists not in what comrade Mintz believes it to be, but in the fact that a number of chapters of the *History of the C.P.S.U.* sin exactly against that very objectivity.

While pointing out the most important errors in my work as editor-in-chief of the collective work *History of the C.P.S.U.*, I consider it necessary to recognize at the same time that this work undoubtedly contains many other mutually interconnected errors in matters of principle and history about which I have repeatedly warned in calling upon all those working in the field of history to aid in laying bare and correcting.

Without such help it is impossible "to raise the questions of the history of the Bolshevism of our Party to a high, scientific, Bolshevik level."

All the four published volumes of the *History of the C.P.S.U.* are being basically revised at the present time and corrected under the direction of the Central Committee.

EM. YAROSLAVSKY.

* * * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DECISION OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CENTRAL CONTROL COMMISSION OF THE C.P.S.U., DECEMBER 19, 1931

Having listened to the statement of comrade Yaroslavsky, the Presidium of the C. C. C. establishes that:

1. The Trotskyist counter-revolutionary and right opportunists, whose attempts to openly counterpose their petty-bourgeois Menshevik line against the general Leninist line of the Party have been exposed and defeated by the Party, have now taken the bourgeois road of concealed and contrabandist smuggling of their viewpoints in a series of philosophical and historical works (writings, treatises), taking advantage of the rotten liberalism and the dull state of class vigilance manifested among a certain section of the staffs at the head of scientific institutions.

2. Comrade Yaroslavsky failed to take cognizance in due time of these bourgeois methods of the Trotskyists directed against the Party and, while editing the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, permitted a number of the crudest errors of a principle and historical nature to creep in.

In view of the insufficient attention given to the selection of the editorial staff, as well as the careless editing of the *History of the C.P.S.U.* under the supervision of comrade Yaroslavsky, several instances are found in this work of presenting Trotskyist interpretations of the role of our Party during the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, attaining the magnitude of slander against Lenin, the Party and its leadership.

3. Accepting the letter of comrade Yaroslavsky in the *Pravda* of December 10 as satisfactory, the Presidium of the C.C.C. is confident that comrade Yaroslavsky will correct the errors he committed, and will carry on a determined struggle against the falsifiers of the history of our Party.

PRESIDIUM OF THE C. C. C. OF THE C. P. S. U.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Communist Party and Parliamentarism

THESES ADOPTED BY THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL— JULY 17-AUGUST 7, 1920

I. THE NEW EPOCH AND THE NEW PARLIAMENTARISM

THE attitude of the Socialist parties towards parliamentarism was originally, at the time of the First International, one of utilizing the bourgeois parliament for purposes of agitation. Participation in parliamentary activity was looked upon from the point of view of developing class consciousness, *i.e.*, of awakening in the proletariat class hostility toward the ruling class. Changes in this attitude were brought about not through change of doctrine, but under the influence of political development. Owing to the uninterrupted advance of the forces of production and the widening sphere of capitalist exploitation, capitalism, and together with it the parliamentary state, acquired a lasting stability.

This gave rise to the adaptability of the parliamentary tactics of the Socialist parties to "organic" legislative activity in the bourgeois parliament, and the ever-growing significance of the struggle for reforms within the capitalist system, as well as the predominating influence of the so-called "immediate demand" and the conversion of the maximum program into a figure of speech as an altogether remote "final goal." This served as a basis for the development of parliamentary careerism, corruption, and open or hidden betrayal of the fundamental interests of the working class.

The attitude of the Third International towards parliamentarism is determined not by a new doctrine, but by the changed goal of parliamentarism itself. During the previous epoch parliament performed a certain progressive function as the weapon of developing capitalism, but under the present conditions of unbridled imperialism, parliament has become a tool of falsehood, deceit, violence, and enervating gossip. In the ruin, parliamentary reforms, devoid of system, of constancy, and of definite plan, have lost every practical significance for the working masses.

Parliament has lost is stability like the whole of bourgeois society. The sudden transition from the organic to the critical epoch has created the foundation for new proletarian tactics in the field of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parliamentarism. The Russian Workers' Party (Bolsheviks) had already worked out the essence of revolutionary parliamentarism in the preceding period, owing to the fact that Russia, since 1905, had lost its political and social equilibrium and had entered upon the period of storm and stress.

To the extent that some Socialists with an inclination for Communism point out that the moment of revolution in their respective countries has not yet arrived, and so decline to break away from the parliamentary opportunists, they are reasoning consciously or unconsciously from the assumption that the present epoch is one of relative stability for imperialist society, and they are assuming, therefore, that practical results may be achieved in the struggle for reform by a coalition with such men as Turati and Longuet. As soon as Communism comes to light, it must begin to elucidate the character of the present epoch (the culuminations of capitalism, imperialistic self-negation and self-destruction, uninterrupted growth of civil war, etc.). Political relationships and political groupings may be different in different countries, but the essence of the matter is everywhere the same: we must start with the direct preparation for a proletarian uprising, politically and technically, for the destruction of the bourgeoisie and for the creation of the new proletarian state.

Parliament at present can in no way serve as the arena of struggle for reform, for improving the lot of the working people, as it has at certain periods of the preceding epoch. The center of gravity of political life at present has been completely and finally transferred beyond the limits of parliament. On the other hand, owing not only to its relationship to the working masses, but also to the complicated mutual relations within the various groups of the bourgeoisie itself, the bourgeoisie is forced to have some of its policies in one way or another passed through parliament, where the various cliques haggle for power, exhibit their strong sides and betray their weak ones, get themselves unmasked, etc., etc. Therefore it is the immediate historical task of the working class to tear this apparatus out of the hands of the ruling class, to break and destroy it, and to create in its place a new proletarian apparatus. At the same time, however, the revolutionary general staff of the working class is vitally concerned in having its scouting parties in the parliamentary institutions of the bourgeoisie, in order to facilitate this task of destruction.

Thus the fundamental difference between the tactics of Communists entering parliament with revolutionary aims in view, and the tactics of the Socialist parliamentarians, becomes perfectly clear.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The latter act on the assumption of the relative stability and the indefinite durability of the existing order, they consider it their task to achieve reforms by all means and are concerned to make the masses appreciative of every accomplishment as the merit of Social Democratic parliamentarism (Turati, Longuet and Company).

Instead of the old compromising parliamentarism a new parliamentarism has come to life, as a weapon for the destruction of parliamentarism as a whole. But the aversion towards the traditional practices of the old parliamentarism drives some revolutionary elements into the camp of the opponents of parliamentarism on principle (I. W. W., the revolutionary Syndicalists, German Communist Labor Party).

Taking all this into consideration, the Second Congress adopts the following theses:

II. COMMUNISM, THE STRUGGLE FOR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, AND THE UTILIZATION OF THE BOURGEOIS PARLIAMENT

1. Parliamentarism as a state system, has become a "democratic" form of the rule of the bourgeoisie which, at a certain stage of its development, needs the fiction of national representation, which outwardly would be an organization of a "national will" standing outside of classes, but in reality is an instrument of oppression and suppression in the hands of the ruling capitalists.

2. Parliamentarism is a definite form of state order. Therefore it can in no way be a form of Communist society, which recognizes neither classes, nor class struggle, nor any form of state authority.

3. Parliamentarism cannot be a form of proletarian government during the transition period between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat. At the moment when the accentuated class struggle turns into civil war, the proletariat must inevitably form its state organization as a fighting organization, which cannot contain any of the representatives of the former ruling classes; all fictions of a "national will" are harmful to the proletariat at that time, and a parliamentary division of authority is needless and injurious to it; the only form of proletarian dictatorship is a Republic of Soviets.

4. The bourgeois parliaments, which constitute one of the most important instruments of the state machinery of the bourgeoisie, cannot be won over by the proletariat any more than can the bourgeois order in general. The task of the proletariat consists in blowing up the whole machinery of the bourgeoisie, in destroying it, and all the parliamentary institutions with it, whether they be republican or constitutional-monarchial.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. The same relates to the local government institutions of the bourgeoisie, which theoretically it is not correct to differentiate from state organizations. In reality they are part of the same apparatus of the State machinery of the bourgeoisie which must be destroyed by the revolutionary proletariat and replaced by local Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

6. Consequently, Communism repudiates parliamentarism as a form of the future; it renounces the same as a form of the class dictatorship of the proletariat; it repudiates the possibility of winning over the parliaments; its aim is to destroy parliamentarism. Therefore it is only possible to speak of utilizing the bourgeois state organizations with the object of destroying them. The question can be discussed only and exclusively on such a plane.

7. All class struggle is a political struggle, because it is finally a struggle for power. Any strike, when it spreads through the whole country, is a menace to the bourgeois state, and thus acquires a political character. To strive to overthrow the bourgeoisie, and to destroy its state, means to carry on political warfare. To create one's own class apparatus—for the bridling and suppression of the resisting bourgeoisie, whatever such an apparatus may be—means to gain political power.

8. Consequently, the question of a political struggle does not end in the question of one's attitude towards the parliamentary system. It is a general condition of the class struggle of the proletariat, insofar as the struggle grows from a small and personal one to a general struggle for the overthrow of the capitalist order as a whole.

9. The elementary means of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organized masses of the proletariat, under the direction of a united, disciplined, centralized Communist Party. *Civil war is war.* In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to conduct operations during all the stages of that fight.

10. The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing more acute in form, and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of government. In this warfare of the masses developing into a civil war, the guiding Party of the proletariat must, as a general rule, secure every and all lawful positions, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work, and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle.

11. One such auxiliary support is the rostrum of the bourgeois

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parliament. Against participation in a political campaign one should not use the argument that parliament is a bourgeois government institution. The Communist Party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work, but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within (for instance, the work of Liebknecht in Germany, of the Bolsheviks in the Imperial Duma, in the "Democratic Conference," in the "Parliament" of Kerensky, and lastly, in the "Constituent Assembly," and also in the Municipal Dumas, and the activities of the Bulgarian Communists).

12. This work within the parliaments, which consists chiefly in making revolutionary propaganda from the parliamentary platform, the denouncing of enemies, the ideological unification of the masses, who are still looking up to the parliamentary platform, captivated by democratic illusions, especially in backward territories, etc., must be fully subordinated to the objects and tasks of the mass struggle outside the parliaments.

The participation in the election campaign and the revolutionary propaganda from the parliamentary tribune has a special importance for the winning over of those elements of the workers, who—as perhaps the agrarian working masses—have stood far away from the revolutionary movement and political life.

13. If the Communists have the majority in the local government institutions, they must: (a) carry on a revolutionary opposition against the bourgeois central authority; (b) do all for the aid of the poor population (economic measures, establishment or attempt to establish an armed workers' militia); (c) point out on every occasion the barriers which the bourgeois state power puts against really great changes; (d) develop on this basis the sharpest revolutionary propaganda without fearing a conflict with the state authorities; (e) under certain conditions substitute local Workers' Councils for the municipal administration. The whole activity of the Communists in the municipal administration therefore must be a part of the general work of destruction of the capitalist system.

14. The election campaign must be carried on not in the sense of obtaining a maximum of votes, but in that of a revolutionary mobilization of the masses around the slogans of the proletarian revolution. The election campaign must be conducted by the entire mass of Party members, not by the leaders alone; it is necessary to make use of and be in complete touch with all the manifestations of the masses (strikes, demonstrations, movements among the soldiers and sailors, etc.) going on at the moment; it is necessary to summon all the masses of the proletarian organizations to active work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

15. In complying with all these conditions, as well as with those indicated in a special instruction, the parliamentary work must present a direct contrast to the dirty "politics" which has been practiced by the Social Democratic parties of all countries, that enter parliament with the object of supporting that "democratic" institution or, at best, to "win it over." The Communist Party can only recommend a *revolutionary* use of the parliament as exemplified by Karl Liebknecht, Haeglund and the Bolsheviks.

16. "Anti-parliamentarism," in principle, in the sense of an absolute and categorical repudiation of participation in the elections and the parliamentary revolutionary work, cannot, therefore, bear criticism, and is a naive, childish doctrine, which is founded sometimes on a healthy disgust of politicians, but which does not understand the possibilities of revolutionary parliamentarism. Besides, very often this doctrine is connected with a quite erroneous idea of the role of the Party, which in this case is considered not as a fighting, centralized advance guard of the workers, but as a decentralied system of badly joined revolutionary nuclei.

17. On the other hand, an acknowledgement of the value of parliamentary work in no wise leads to an absolute, in-all-and-any-case acknowledgement of the necessity of concrete elections and a concrete participation in parliamentary sessions. The matter depends upon a series of specific conditions. Under certain circumstances it may become necessary to leave the parliament. The Bolsheviks did so when they left the pre-parliament in order to break it up, to weaken it, and to set up against it the Petrograd Soviet, which was then prepared to head the uprising; they acted in the same way in the Constituent Assembly on the day of its dissolution, converting the Third Congress of Soviets into the center of political events. In other circumstances a boycotting of the elections may be necessary, and a direct, violent storming of both the great bourgeois State apparatus and the parliamentary bourgeois clique, or a participation in the elections with a boycott of the parliament itself, etc.

18. In this way, while recognizing as a general rule the necessity of participating in the election to the central parliament, and the institutions of local self-government, as well as in the work of such institutions, the Communist Party must decide the question concretely, according to the specific conditions of the given moment. Boycotting the elections or the parliament, or leaving the parliament, is permissible, chiefly when there is a possibility of an immediate transition to an armed fight for power.

19. At the same time one must constantly bear in mind the relative unimportance of this question. If the center of gravity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies in the struggle for the power outside the parliament, then naturally the question of a proletarian dictatorship and a mass fight for it is immeasurably greater than the secondary one of using the parliament.

20. Therefore the Communist International insists categorically that it considers any division or attempt at a division within the Communist Parties along this line a crime against the labor movement. The Congress calls upon all the elements which are in favor of the mass struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, and of being under the direction of a centralized Party of the revolutionary proletariat for gaining influence over all the mass organizations of the working class, to strive for a complete unity between the Communist elements, notwithstanding any possible disagreement on the question of utilizing the bourgeois parliaments.

III. REVOLUTIONARY PARLIAMENTARISM

For securing the real execution of revolutionary parliamentary tactics it is necessary that:

1. The Communist Party in general and its Central Committee should, during *the preparatory stage,* before the parliamentary elections, inspect very carefully the quality of the personnel of the parliamentary factions. The Central Committee should be responsible for the parliamentary Communist fraction. The Central Committee shall have the undeniable right to reject any candidate of any organization, if it is not perfectly convinced that such candidate will carry on a real Communist policy while in parliament.

The Communist Parties must desist from the old Social Democratic habit of electing as delegates only the so-called "experienced" parliamentarians, chiefly lawyers, and so on. As a rule workmen should be put forward as candidates, without troubling about the fact that these may be sometimes simple rank-and-file workmen. The Communist Party must treat with merciless contempt all elements who try to make a career by joining the Party just before the elections in order to get into parliament. The Central Committees of the Communist Parties must sanction the candidacy of only such men as by long years of work have proved their unwavering loyalty to the working class.

2. When the elections are over, the organization of the parliamentary fractions must be wholly in the hands of the Central Committee of the Communist Party—whether the Party in general is a lawful or unlawful one at the given moment. The chairman and the bureau of the parliamentary fraction of the Communists must be confirmed in their functions by the Central Commit-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tee of the Party. The Central Committee of the Party must have its permanent representatives in the parliamentary fractions with the right to veto. On all important political questions the parliamentary fraction shall get preliminary instructions from the Central Committee of the Party.

At each forthcoming important debate of the Communists in the parliament, the Central Committee shall be entitled and bound to appoint or reject the orator of the fraction, to demand that he submit previously the theses of his speech, or the text, for confirmation by the Central Committee, etc. Each candidate entered in the list of the Communists must sign a paper to the effect that at he first request of the Central Committee of the Party he shall be bound to give up his mandate, in order that in a given situation the act of leaving the parliament may be executed in unison.

3. In countries where reformist, semi-reformist or simply career-seeking elements have managed to penetrate into the parliamentary fraction of the Communists (as already happened in several places), the Central Committee of the Communist Parties are bound radically to weed out the personnel of the fractions, on the principle that it is better for the cause of the working class to have a small but truly Communist fraction than a large one without a regular Communist line of conduct.

4. A Communist delegate, by decision of the Central Committee, is bound to combine lawful work with unlawful work. In countries where the Communist delegate enjoys a certain inviolability, this must be utilized by way of rendering assistance to illegal organizations and for the propaganda of the Party.

5. The Communist members shall make all their parliamentary work dependent on the work of the Party outside the parliament. The regular proposing of demonstrative measures, not for the purpose of propaganda, agitation, and organization, must be carried on under the direction of the Party and its Central Committee.

6. In the event of labor demonstrations in the streets or other revolutionary movements, the Communist members must occupy the most conspicuous place—at the head of the proletarian masses.

7. The Communist deputies must try to get in touch (under the control of the Party) with the revolutionary working men, peasants, and other workers either by correspondence or otherwise. They must in no way act like the Social Democratic deputies who carry on mere business relations with the constituents. *They must always be at the disposal of the Communist organizations for propaganda work in the country.*

8. Each Communist member must remember that he is not a "legislator" who is bound to seek agreements with the other legis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lators, but an agitator of the Party, detailed into the enemy's camp in order to carry out the orders of the Party there. The Communist member is answerable not to the wide mass of his constituents, but to his own Communist Party—whether lawful or unlawful.

9. The Communist members must speak in parliament in such a way as to be understood by every workman, peasant, washerwoman, shepherd; so that the Party may publish his speeches and spread them to the most remote villages of the country.

10. The rank-and-file Communist worker must not shrink from speaking in the bourgeois parliaments, and not give way to the so-called experienced parliamentarians, even if such working men members may read their speeches from notes, in order that the speech may be printed afterwards in the papers or in leaflet form.

11. The Communist members must make use of the parliamentary tribune to denounce not only the bourgeoisie and its hangers-on, but also for the denunciation of the social patriots, reformists, the half-and-half politicians of the *center* and other opponents of Communism, and for the wide propagation of the ideas of the Third International.

12. The Communist members, even though there should be only one or two of them in the Parliament, should by their whole conduct challenge capitalism, and never forget that only those are worthy of the name of Communists, who not in words only but in deeds are the mortal enemy of the bourgeois order and its social patriotic flunkies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMPLETE SETS OF

Publications for 1931

AT REDUCED PRICES

Set—Postpaid

THE COMMUNIST $1.40
(Also limited number for 1930)

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE.. 4.20

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL 1.40

These publications contain indispensible information for all those who wish to understand the course of the world economic crisis, the increasing war danger and current questions and policies of the international revolutionary movement.

QUESTIONS OF BUILDING SOCIALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Stalin Pocket Series

THE SIXTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS—Political Report of Joseph Stalin to Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union ..... .50

BUILDING COLLECTIVE FARMS, *by Joseph Stalin* ..... .40

LIFE OF STALIN—A Symposium ..... .40

All three books of this series for $1.25 postpaid

THE SUCCESS OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN, *by V. M. Molotov*.. .15

RED VILLAGES—The 5-Year Plan in Soviet Agriculture, *by Y. A. Yakolev* ..... .50

ON THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

Just Published:

UNEMPLOYED COUNCILS IN ST. PETERSBURG IN 1906 *by Sergei Malyshev* ..... .15

THE STRIKE OF THE DREDGING FLEET, *by Peter Nikiforov* .15

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Save the Daily Worker

for leadership in the struggle against wage cuts, starvation and imperialist butchery.

Delay is dangerous. Rush funds now.

Save the workers' paper.

Save the paper that is now fighting in support of the heroic Kentucky and Tennessee miners.

Save the paper that is helping to organize mass demonstrations to free the Scottsboro boys.

Save the paper that is helping to organize mass demonstrations for unemployment insurance.

The Daily Worker, in this critical period, must not now be allowed to be snowed under by the debts it has incurred in its fight to unite the masses of workers.

Rush every nickel and dime you can spare to the aid of the Daily Worker.

Every dollar sent to the Daily Worker is a direct blow against capitalism.

Support the $50,000 drive to save the Daily Worker.

SEND YOUR DONATIONS AT ONCE TO

Daily Worker

Central Organ of the Communist Party U.S.A.

35 East 12th Street New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED